DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 081 CS 504 065

AUTHOR	Gillespie, Patti P., Ed.
TITLE	Theatre Administration.
INSTITUTION	Association for Communication Administration, Falls Church, Va.
PUB DATE	Jan 83
NOTE	100p.; Best copy available.
AVAILABLE FROM	ACA/Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Rd., Annandale, VA 22003 ($7.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
JOURNAL CIT	ACA Bulletin; spec iss 43 Jan 1983
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Educational Trends; *Evaluation Methods; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS	*Theater Administration

ABSTRACT

The theme of this special journal issue is theatre administration. The journal is divided into four parts: a short introduction and three major sections on the role of the theatre chair, theatre administration in the 1980's, and evaluating creative work. Among others, topics covered in the issue's 13 articles include (1) the changing nature of the job, (2) the chairperson as change agent, (3) the theatre administrator in the 1980's, (4) retrenchment and revival, (5) evaluating theatrical directors for promotion and tenure, and (6) evaluative criteria for theatre arts in the secondary school. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED224081

ACA Bulletin

Issue No. 43 January, 1983

Theatre Administration

Edited by
Patti P. Gillespie

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AS004065

ACA

Association for Communication Administration

BULLETIN

Issue #43 — January, 1983

IN THIS ISSUE

Theatre Administration
A Theme Issue

Edited by
Patti P. Gillespie

Theatre Administration: An Introduction
Patti P. Gillespie 2

The Role of the Theatre Chair
The Changing Nature of the Job,
John A. Walker 4
The Chairperson as Change Agent,
Stephen M. Archer 7
The Producer in the College Theatre,
Philip Hill 10

Theatre Administration in the 1980s
The Theatre Administrator in the 1980s,
Vera Mowry Roberts 12
Theatre Administration for the 1980s: Strategies for Program Clarity, *Greg Kunesh* 14
Small College Solutions to Big Production Problems: New Guidelines for the Years Ahead, *William Grange* 17
Retrenchment and Revival,
Patti P. Gillespie 20

Evaluating Creative Work
Evaluating Theatrical Directors for Promotion and Tenure, *Larry D. Clark* 24
More Questions About "Non-Academic" Creative Activities in Theatre, *Alvin Goldfarb* 26
A Case Study: Extramural Evaluation of Theatrical Production at the University of Louisville,
Albert J. Harris 30
External Evaluation at Washington University in St Louis, *Sidney J. Friedman* 35
Alien Theatre and The Departmental Resume,
Daniel W. Alkofer 38
Evaluative Criteria for Theatre Arts in the Secondary School, *Lynn Murray* 40

Legal Aspects of Administration
Gender and Academic Specialization in Graduate Theatre Programs in the United States, *Philip Emmert* and *Theodore Clevenger, Jr.* 49
Some Legal Conclusions Regarding Non-Renewal and Dismissal, *Dennis J. Sporre* 55
Faculty Civil Rights: Judicial Review of Hiring, Dismissal, Non-Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure Decisions, *Gregory B. Adams* 58
Bent is a Four-Letter Word, *Jeffrey Huberman* 62

General Theatre Administration
Closing the Budgetary Gap: Building Subscription Audiences by Design, *William V. Patterson* 66
Summer Theatre at the University of Northern Iowa, *D. Terry Williams* 72
Toward a Study of the Relationships Between the University Theatre Program and the Resident Professional Theatre Company, *Lorayne W. Lester* 75
Theatre Appreciation: A Pilot Program in Telecourse Work in Theatre, *Dorothy Webb* 79
Soviet Theatre and Television in Mutual Enhancement, *Miriam Morton* 82
Anatomy of the Struggle, *Susan Pearson-Davis* 85
Gallaudet College Theatre Touring Company, *Joanne E. Tracy* 89

Presidential Message: A Call to Participate in Defining the Field, *Theodore Clevenger, Jr.* 90
ACA News
1982 *Bulletin* Manuscript Information 91
8 Constitutional Amendments Approved 92
Ted Clevenger Assumes Presidency for 1983 92
The New President-Elect: James E. Roever 92
Executive Committee Welcomes 3 New Members 92
Incorporation Approved 92
Texas Forms State ACA Affiliate 92
Regional ACA Programming
Savannah to Host SETC 93
WSCA Meets in Albuquerque 93
Orlando Welcomes SSCA 94
Lincoln is Site for CSSA, and ACA Executive Committee 94
ECA Meets at Maryland Resort 95
About the Authors 96

Theatre Administration: An Introduction

Patti P. Gillespie

Although the administration of a theatre program bears certain resemblances to the administration of any other academic program, it displays other qualities that are quite unique. Public performances require theatre administrators to deal regularly with questions of royalty and copyright; the needs of each production cause theatre administrators to master the intricacies of purchasing systems (and to devise techniques for circumventing them); the controversial nature of much contemporary drama leads theatre administrators periodically to confront attempts at censorship. Because many theatre faculty make theatre rather than books, their tenure and promotion is often difficult; because they are often in the theatre rather than in the library, their work is sometimes viewed with suspicion by other members of the academic community; because their seasons often include *Grease* as well as *Everyman*, their academic respectability is sometimes challenged.

Theatre administrators, thus, work regularly to solve problems rarely encountered by administrators of other, more traditional, departments. It is to theatre administrators that this issue of the *Bulletin* is dedicated. By means of this issue as well, ACA formally welcomes the Chief Administrators Program of the University and College Theatre Association to its ranks. We look forward to a productive and beneficial liaison.

The articles within this issue present both philosophic and practical help to theatre administrators.

In the first unit, The Role of The Theatre Chair is examined by John Walker, (former head of the theatre program at Ohio State University), Stephen Archer (long-time theatre administrator at the University of Missouri, Columbia), and Phil Hill, (chair and producer at Furman University in South Carolina). Walker explores the changing role of the theatre administrator as university governance becomes more complex; Archer urges that theatre administrators become agents for change rather than mere accommodators to change; and Hill examines

the tension that results from the chair's dual role as academic leader and artistic producer.

Because part of the administrator's responsibility is to anticipate new directions and new solutions, the second part of this issue provides articles by four administrators who look at Theatre Administration During the 1980s. Although all agree that the times are troubling, all suggest ways for meeting the challenges of the decade so as to survive -- and even prosper -- during the predicted period of retrenchment. Vera Mowry Roberts (Hunter College) counsels all chairs to remain flexible, imaginative, objective, and -- above all -- to keep a sense of humor as they confront the coming, tough, years. Greg Kunesh (University of Oklahoma) cautions us to plan not only physical and curricular matters but also psychic rewards to faculty members so as to keep morale high even when monies are low. William Grange addresses problems peculiar to the small college as it fights to survive the period of retrenchment; and Gillespie, University of Maryland, pleads for accepting quality as the determining factor when making necessary decisions about which programs to reduce or eliminate as we begin serious retrenchment.

Among the most vexing problems to confront arts administrators are those dealing with evaluation. University and college chairs struggle with making judgments and then constructing persuasive cases for tenure promotion, and merit raises, while in K-12 programs, the problems usually center on questions of teacher preparation and certification. Both sets of problems are explored in the section, Evaluating Creative Work. It is testimony to the difficulty of the issues raised that the proposed solutions are often contradictory. Indeed, among the six administrators struggling with these matters, agreement is as rare as it is welcome.

In Legal Aspects of Administration, guidance is offered in matters of retention, tenure, promotion, affirmative action, and censorship.. As a result of a national survey recently completed, Ted Clevenger (Florida State University) and Phil Emmert (University of Wyoming) offer needed information about the successes -- and failures -- of affirmative action, for the first time theatre administrators have access to timely information on the hiring pool in theatre and on theatre women's perceptions of their own status in the field. Dennis Sporre (University of North Carolina, Wilmington) and Greg Adams (University of South Carolina) examine current trends in judicial decisions regarding retention, tenure, and promotion. As well, Jeffrey Huberman's case study of attempted censorship at Indiana-Purdue University at Ft. Wayne shows how fragile is the principle of free speech and how easy its abandonment under fire.

The final section, General Theatre Administration, ranges widely through a number of topics of special interest to theatre administrators. William Patterson (University of Maryland) describes techniques for developing audiences. Terry Williams (Western Michigan University) outlines procedures for establishing a successful dinner theatre within an academic context. Lorayne Lester (University of Tennessee) discusses the problems faced by programs striving to integrate a professional company with the university's production program. Dorothy Webb (Indiana-Purdue University, Indianapolis) describes a successful program that uses television to teach theatre to non-traditional students. Miriam Morton explains how the Soviets prize and protect their theatre artists. Susan Pearson-Davis (University of New Mexico), by means of a case study, shows how even strong programs can fall to shrinking budgets without well understood goals, programatic integration, and administrative support.

The sections of this issue and the articles within each, then, are like the field of theatre itself: diverse, exciting, and provocative.

THE CHANGING NATURE OF THE JOB

John A. Walker

"Are Department Chairs Obsolete?" A partial answer must be "Yes," if one thinks of earlier days of the "grand old men" of educational theatre, the E.C. Mabies, the Alexander Drummonds, the Frederick Kochs, the Lowell Lees, the Lee Norvelles, the Glenn Hughes, and others. Such pioneers were frequently despots, benevolent or otherwise, who ruled their departments with virtually unlimited authority, whose word and will were nearly unchallenged so long as they operated within the general guidelines of their respective institutions. Generally their tenure also was unlimited, and their departments clearly bore the personal stamp of one person's hand. Those days, and such department chairs, are gone.

The reasons for that fact are many, not the least of which is that the nature of the job has changed so drastically that many people simply do not want the job for more than the now normal three to five years term, if at all. The job of the chair has expanded in number and range of responsibilities, activities, deadlines, pressures, and pace. Instead of the loose, informal, personal relations characteristic of a generation ago, there is now a greatly enlarged bureaucracy involving more time, more people, and more paper. Chairs are drowning in paper work.

A 1975 Occasional Paper published by the American Council on Education, "The Job of the Academic Department Chairman," by Herbert Waltzer, reviews the major responsibilities of today's chair. Here and elsewhere in this paper I have leaned heavily on this resource. Waltzer describes eight major groupings of duties as follows:

Departmental Affairs: To develop and/or accomplish the departmental mission and objectives; to establish policies; to conduct department meetings; to involve faculty and students in departmental decision making; and to establish and maintain internal communication.

Academic Affairs: To establish degree programs and curricula; to evaluate and improve programs, curricula, and instruction; to enforce academic standards; and to prepare course schedules.

Faculty Affairs: To recruit, hire, and orient new faculty; to encourage faculty growth and quality in teaching, research, and professional activities; to enforce faculty responsibilities and protect faculty rights; to evaluate faculty members and make recommendations for retention, tenure, promotion, and salary increases.

Student Affairs: To serve as advisor; to make awards; to respond to grievances; to recruit; to award appointments and supervise graduate assistants; to check graduation requirements.

External Communication: To convey university policies and actions to the department; to represent the department in the university and with external agencies; to communicate department programs and activities to students.

Budgetary Affairs: To prepare annual budget requests; to administer budgetary allocations; to promote department cost-effectiveness; and to allocate faculty travel and research funds.

Office Management: To administer department facilities; to hire, supervise, and evaluate non-teaching staff personnel; to establish file and record systems; to maintain departmental equipment and property; to requisition supplies; and to order text books.

Personal Professional Performance: To provide leadership and example in the department; to demonstrate professional competence in teaching, research, and other professional activities; and to participate in professional associations and community service.

These responsibilities to a greater or lesser extent are, of course, shared by all chairs throughout the college or university. But it is my contention that the job of the theatre department chair is further complicated by the nature of the enterprise itself. The two principal complications, shared only by chairs of other performing arts departments such as music and dance, are (1) that theatre chairs also must supervise active production programs involving large commitments of university resources--money, physical facilities and equipment, and personnel--and (2) that they must deal with frequently volatile and hopefully creative people with their own egoes, drives, and artistic ambitions. While life in the chair's office is busy, it is seldom dull. In any event we can add to the previous list of responsibilities the very demanding one of administering the theatre production program, including the establishment and observance of policies, the selection of the production program and

directors, setting up schedules, allocating resources, promoting and marketing the program, handling ticket sales, arranging for the comfort and safety of audiences, and the myriad other details of planning and conducting a successful production program.

So the theatre department chair bears many responsibilities: departmental affairs, external communications, budgetary affairs, office management, personal professional performance, and overseeing the planning and operation of the production program.

Obviously, except possibly in the very small administrative unit, no one person can discharge all these responsibilities alone but must delegate a great deal to others. Chairs must be given or devise a plan or pattern of departmental organization and administration that will ensure the efficient operation of the department and relieve them of many day-to-day operational details. But they cannot escape the fact that "the buck stops here," that they must bear the burden of final accountability.

As the author of the ACE pamphlet points out, the chair is continually faced with competing demands on time and energies as well as conflicting values for collegial governance. The job frequently involves transmitting, interpreting, defending, and implementing policy and procedures for the faculty and staff as passed down from the upper administration and developed without the involvement of the chair or the faculty. More and more the heavy hand of the Federal and the state government is felt, affecting policy, generating more managerial chores, and requiring reports for governmental agencies and professional associations. Occasionally chairs are called on to mediate in matters involving professional competence, academic freedom of faculty, and the ultimate authority of the institution. Chairs are constantly having to translate the demands and expectations of the program into human particulars in such matters as faculty loads, class schedules, tenure and promotion, salary increments, academic standards, and the like. They must manage administrative directives and collegial decision making. They must balance faculty and student desire for involvement in policy and decision making against the time they have available and are willing to devote. Chairs must accept responsibility for department affairs but maintain a stance of being one among equals. They must retain the friendship and respect of colleagues while exercising considerable control over their colleagues, professional lives and futures, even on occasion while implementing policies that directly affect a skeptical or hostile faculty. And, finally, any chair may face the prospect of returning to faculty status.

One virtue of such studies as this and other discussions of the job of the department chair is the relief and comfort derived from knowing you are not alone! Each spring, the chairs or directors of theatre of the "Big Ten" schools meet for one or two days to discuss various matters brought to the group by those participating. At a recent meeting, the major topic was "who runs the department?" The answers were as many as the participants, revealing a range of organizational plans and assignment of responsibilities for decision making from virtually full control of the faculty to largely centralized control by the chair. Generally, however, two patterns emerged, a chair-centered one and a faculty-centered one, the first a generally pyramidal structure with the chair assisted by various individuals and/or committees, and the second a relatively diffuse one with responsibility for various aspects of the operation spread over virtually the entire faculty. In the first group, the chair apparently spends a great deal of time listening and talking to many faculty and students before making decisions, and in the second he spends a lot of time nudging and persuading committees to come to a decision, sometimes any decision!

The newly appointed chair may or may not have the privilege, or the obligation, of choosing the pattern of departmental organization and administration; most likely it will be one that is inherited with the job. In such case it may be one that has been set down in a document and formally adopted, or it may, on the other hand, be largely, if not entirely, a set of assumptions in the minds of various faculty members--and not necessarily the same set of assumptions for all faculty. Then, there will be expectations, perhaps assumptions, on the part of the dean or such other person or persons to whom the chair reports. It is entirely possible, even probable, that there will be some areas of disagreement or conflict between the expectations of the faculty, the dean, the students, and the chair. So the first task of any new chairperson is to find out as clearly as possible what is expected and how to operate.

Hopefully, the job already will have described in a general way what the particular responsibilities are; and there may be a charge, written or verbal, from the dean or a search committee that will provide additional information. But these are not likely to tell very much about how to go about meeting assigned responsibilities. Also there may be guidelines set down in a faculty handbook or established by the office of academic affairs. Almost certainly there will be operational policies and procedures stated in an operations manual or there will be a set of documents for handling routine matters such as purchasing, paying bills, hiring and evaluating non-teaching personnel, preparing and submitting course schedules, and handling much of the routine paper work. Then, too, faculty rules and/or directives from upper levels of the academic administration will provide other guidelines relating to the recruitment, evaluation, and advancement or termination of faculty (with due consideration of federal, state, and institutional regulations), changes in academic programs and courses, rights and privileges of faculty, and the like. The chair must become well acquainted as soon as possible with such rules and regulations which increasingly, in recent years have come to govern the actions and establish the parameters of the job. But, again, although such manuals, rules, regulations, and procedures will give explicit directions on what is to be done, they likely will provide little more than implicit guides as

to how to do it. So the new chair must turn to other sources to learn what "rules of the road" may exist as guides to avoid the potential pitfalls, hazards, and collisions that lie ahead.

Whatever these "rules" may be, stated or merely understood, it is nearly certain that not everyone directly concerned, perhaps including the department chair, will be satisfied with them. Fortunate indeed is the chair who inherits a clear, precise pattern of departmental organization and administration which is satisfactory to chair and colleagues alike. This is not to suggest that the job will then be easy, of course, but certainly it will be less difficult. The chances are, however, that the chair will feel a need for changes to suit a personal style, and/or that others--faculty members, students, or the dean--will have reservations or objections to the existing pattern. So, a high priority on a chair's time and energy, as well as on administrative and persuasive skills, may be adapting, amplifying, clarifying, and/or enforcing the existing plan. Even the department chair who has been operating successfully under a well designed and mutually satisfactory system may find that changing circumstances, shifts in personnel, or new directives will demand adjustments to meet those different needs. In a very real sense the operational plan must be under continual review and periodically up-dated as necessary to retain currency. This may be the time when the chair's persuasive and administrative abilities are challenged to the utmost to do what is necessary and still maintain cordial relationships and retain the respect of a "skeptical" or "hostile faculty."

The new chair also may have a mandate, whether handed down or self-generated, to make significant changes in department programs, curricular and/or production. Indeed a chair may find it necessary to change the whole thrust of the department, to develop a new mission and set of objectives, or to turn the entire program around. While such a change may be welcome as a wonderful opportunity, it also will surely be a tremendous challenge to a chair's wisdom, persuasive and communicative skills, diplomacy, and organization and administrative abilities. While Oscar Wilde observed that he could resist anything but temptation, it also may be observed that many faculty members resist nothing so vigorously as change. It may, in fact, be said that faculty sometimes are just like people! The chair who must institute sweeping changes, with attendant reassignments of responsibilities, revision of curricula, different ways of doing things, and the like, may face a very trying time indeed, however much the opportunity is welcomed.

Finally, it is certain that the demands of the job will force the chair to make some hard choices about how limited time and energy will be spent. How much teaching can a new chair do, and what courses will he or she teach? How much directing or designing or how much research and publication, can the chair continue? To take on the additional duties and responsibilities of departmental administration and to function effectively, the new chair will have to reduce drastically some if not all other activities. It may mean that he or she will have to shelve temporarily other plans or even forego the very things which were most enjoyed and which were in large part responsibile for the teaching appointment in the first place. Chairs will have to make some very real sacrifices, and they will have to find their satisfaction and rewards in other ways. They will have to develop new abilities and refine old skills and become a manager, an administrator, and an executive who will deal constantly with new challenges and demands.

Is the department chair obsolete? Certainly not. But the job is considerably more complex and challenging than it was only a few years ago. It cannot be regarded merely as a recognition or honor bestowed for past services. Chairs should not accept the appointment unless they are prepared to make the necessary sacrifices of personal and professional aims and goals, possible even family relations, unless they are ready to give the time and energy demanded, and unless they feel they can find in it the satisfaction of doing well a frequently distasteful and frustrating job. It helps if a chair can live on the razor's edge and balance on a tightrope, even if he/she cannot walk on water. There is, after all, the consideration that somebody has to do it.

THE CHAIRPERSON AS CHANGE AGENT

Stephen M. Archer

The changing role of the departmental chair was brought home to me in a recent letter from Loren Reid, one-time chairperson at the University of Missouri. Because this letter is so instructive, it is reproduced in full: *I think an argument can be made for the chairperson's holding the most demanding job on the administrative ladder. He is middle management, responsible both to those above him and below him without much real authority except as he is reasonable and persuasive. His problems are invariably people problems. Students have his ear, as do faculty; other department chairpersons can get to him, and so can parents.*

Deans might say the same, but I expect a dean can exert more influence for or against certain departments than a chairperson can pick and choose among the areas of a department. These things have certainly always been true. But it seems to me that the upper levels have begun to demand more in the way of surveys, reports, estimates, plans, projections, costs, targets, missions. And generally in a hurry. Numbers have begun to count for more. Decisions can be made and justified on the basis of numbers. And after a couple of years of normally-stormy life, a chairperson can suddenly be hauled in for an evaluation.

For years I lived in the shadow of Monday-morning myth. "I will come over to the office on Saturday and get this pile of stuff cleaned up, and then Monday I can start with a fresh slate, with thought for teaching and writing." Monday, however, brought fresh onslaughts of administrative problems.

I do not regret having been a chairman; I made a lot of campus acquaintances, especially in administrative circles and among other chairmen. And there are other rewards that come when the program seems to be going well, and teachers and students seem to like what they are doing. In my days at MU we have moved almost wholly from lifetime chairman to rotating chairmen, and I think that reflects the fact that administrative responsibilities have steadily increased.

Good Luck . . .

Because the life of chairperson has grown far more complicated over the past decade, perhaps it is time to rethink the position and to see what non-traditional means amy be at his or her disposal. The term change agent first came to my attention about ten years ago, when Wally Smith (ex-President of the American Theatre Association) and I commiserated about the plight of the theatre. In particular we groused about how to explain what we do to those in higher positions (and at that time, almost everyone's position was higher than Wally's or mine). Wally suggested that the key to promoting theatre in any academic situation lay in finding the person who made the decisions, the person who actually decided things, and then in working on him or her. Although the concept has always had value, the term has only recently come into wide acceptance.

To what extent can a chairperson function as an agent of change? I submit that creativity, surely familiar in some degree to every theatre person, can apply equally to theatre arts and to educational administration. Arthur Koestler describes creativity (and also comedy) as the collision of two matrixes, the combination of elements hitherto uncombined, to form a new entity. This concept has validity for the chairperson, as I hope to show. Susanne Langer defines art as the creation of forms that are expressive or symbolic of human emotion. I suggest that even a column of figures can, when presented with vigor to a Dean, stimulate consideration emotion or even passion (anything from mild discomfort through hostility to outright violence).

I will deal briefly with three administrative areas; (1) the generation and use of numbers, (2) the deployment of training and development programs, and (3) sources of philosophical bases for administrative decisions.

Numbers. A sea of numbers has threatened to set us adrift from both reality and quality. FTEs, GPAs, SCHs, GREs, box office figures, numbers of majors, numbers of advisees, class sizes, budgets, estimated costs, indirect costs, and so on. We find something definitive about a number, especially when it spews forth from a computer. It is as though the machine will brook no argument: *Let the word go from this time and place that in the Fall of 1980 the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art at the University of Missouri-Columbia with a full time equivalent faculty of 13 generated 7,370 student credit hours. Gabatha: "So let it be written, so let it be."*

A flood of such numbers comes from any well-managed dean's office or at least that office makes them available to chairpersons who seek them out. The chairperson should seek them out (although distributing them to faculty members may well prove a waste

of paper). Interpreting those numbers and recombining them can, I believe, put them to work proving half-suspected concepts.

For example, the figures I just used exist in fact; a computer bank contains them. Dividing 7,370 by the FTE of thirteen gives us 290, the average generation of SCH by a faculty member in our department. That figure of 290 means nothing until ranked with similar figures for other departments in our academic unit. In the College of Arts and Sciences, there exist twenty-three departments and/or programs, a happy community of scholars and artists. The generation of SCH by each faculty in that College ranges from a low of eight to a high of 667. Our department ranks fourth out of twenty-three in the generation of SCH, a fact important to impress upon the Dean and the Provost.

Consider numbers of advisees. The number of declared majors or advisees similarly means little until factored by the number of faculty and then ranked with the other departments in the unit. In our College, the number of advisees per faculty ranged from a low of 0.66 to a high of 22.3. Our department ranked first out of the twenty-three departments in this area. I call our Dean daily to give him a reminder of this quantitative fact.

The chair can find other resources available for comparisons. In the August 1981 copy of *The Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, #37, pages 43-44, there is a table entitled "Top Sixty Institutions on the Basis of Quantity of Articles Produced in the Five Refereed Mass Communication Journals During the Period 1970 to 1979." Our department ranked number thirty-five, -- not so high as I would like but still well ahead of others. Indeed, we ranked second among the Big Eight. But this list did not include books or creative endeavors or even theatre articles in refereed journals: ACA or ATA should, probably through the Commission on Theatre Research, generate such figures.

Not all the numbers turn out well. Very few speech and/or theatre departments receive outstanding salaries. The suspicion that threatre study is little more than charades for credit has not died out in this land, although we fight the good fight and will continue to do so. The American Council for the Arts have given us some valuable ammunition in a recent survey. Describing a "veritable explosion in the arts by the American people," they suggest 92% of the American people consider art as generally important to the quality of life in their communities. Further, 59% of those surveyed would willingly pay an extra $15, in taxes to support the arts; 65% would pay $10, and 70% would pay $5.

We have good departmental numbers. Our administration considers us cost efficient. Even other departments admit that. One would assume then, that we must have high salaries. In fact, out of the twenty-three departments in our College of Arts and Science, we rank twentieth; our assistant professors were the worst paid in the College, although I publicly proclaim them an excellent lot of folks. Surely our teaching, production, and publication figures merit a higher average salary.

Back to the calculator and a computer printout of salaries by rank. And there we have it. Factoring full professors by four, associates by three, assistants by two, and instructors by one, our departmental average "age" measured 2.92. Again, a meaningful figure until ranked with the other units. We ranked nineteenth in "age." Is then longevity the only thing in academe that pays off? Are all the other indices irrelevant? Does only time in grade increase salary in the professorial ranks?

Faculty and staff training and development. Those who have become chairperson recall the first day in the office. In my case, my first telephone call came from a new faculty member resigning from the term beginning ten days later. Most of us recall the first budget printout we faced, or the multitude of other forms that threaten us with snowblindness daily. The first training and development that a department needs comes from the department, the outgoing and incoming chairperson ought to spend time together. Too often, a palace coup has resulted in the change, and so the two persons simply pass each other on the way in and out of the office. An hour a day for six weeks, perhaps over the summer, would do much to preserve the department and the new chair's sanity. Should someone warn a new chair about the intricacies of affirmative action, for example? Can we afford learning by trial and error? I think not. We will have at the University of Missouri, Columbia this fall for the first time a new chairperson's workshop. Not much, but a beginning.

If the director of development does his or her job, a chair should find additional help available. Seminars in time management, administrative styles, stress management, self-esteem, filing philosophies, conflict resolution, and budget building are concerns for anyone in middle management. Yet rarely do chairpersons find such seminars available; and when they are offered, chairs often will not attend; they find themselves too busy putting out fires that should never have started. These seminars do not offer panaceas, but they do give extra ammunition with which to go over the top into no man's land.

You may be certain that upper-level administrators (with whom every chair deals) has attended such developmental workshops. Nationally, experts estimate that the ratio of funds devoted to administrative development as compared with faculty development is roughly five to one. This imbalance does not represent a conspiracy to keep professors ignorant; it is rather a matter of pre-existing models for administrative workshops in industry and the private sector. An administrator administrates, just as he does in industry; but a professor, as Pinchwife says of cuckolds in *The Country Wife*, is a kind of a wild beast, for whom no immediate parallel exists. Whereas administrators deal with budgets, salary decisions, performance appraisals, and grants, most professors do not; and yet professors become chairpersons with little or no training. It is a wonder that so many survive, let alone prosper.

If the Dean does not hold annual workshops for new chairpersons, complain bitterly

about it and suggest the need for them. Any department gains by having trained chairpersons in all departments. Trained chairpersons generally will not over-run the budget, leaving another department to make up the difference (out of what it may have left over at the end of the year, which it should not have anyway).

Time does not permit the discussion of the need for training and development for faculty members in the department. But for a simple example, a wealth of good cheap legal advise awaits teachers and artists on tax deductions. How many professors read the annual *Tax Guide for College Teachers and Other College Personnel*, published by the Academic Information Service, Box 4008; Washington, DC 20015? Young professors probably lose a thousand dollars a year in deductions. Every chair should make the volume available to the faculty after carefully reading it first. It may be possible still to deduct a home study, and it may represent as much as a seventh of all household expenses.

Bases for Decisions. Where can a chair turn to assistance when no one offers help? Months before a new chairperson receives his or her appointment, the preparation should begin. Improvement never comes too late, and lots of printed material deserve consideration. A friend of mine, Cal Pritner, former chair, Theatre Arts Department, Illinois State University, Normal, who has just left administration, told me shortly after he learned of my impending doom that I should read Kenneth E. Elble's *The Art of Administration*. I have received no more helpful advice before or since. The volume should rest in your top drawer, and you should be able to find it moldering on a library shelf in the eucation section; if not, write the Jossey-Bass Publishers; 433 California Street, San Francisco, CA 94104. Any volume for administrators that contains chapters entitled, "Keeping Sane" and "Getting Things Done" has to have value. Lots of other sources exist for chairpersons. *The Exceptional Executive: A Psychological Conception*, by Harry Levinson, for example, published by Mentor for $2.50 and geared to the private sector, contains much of value for the academic administrator. Many of the texts in organizational communication and small-group processes have merit, much of it dealing with the clarification of communication processes in departmental sized group. Every educator should read *The Chronicle for Higher Education*, especially the chairperson. The *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin* offers help for planning strategies, comparing departments, and gaining insights into the practices of other administrators in comparable departments. I recommend it highly. Ultimately, you have your own resources. Many theatre people have considerable experience directing plays. The small-group skills sharpened by directing apply directly to the operation of a department, although the authority of grades has been exchanged for that of salary increases. And as Lyndon Baines Johnson used to say, "when you've got them by their pocket books, their hearts and minds will follow."

All this sounds challenging, even fun, some days. It resembles playing chess (which I recommend as training for such a position), for one learns a lot about trade-offs, strategy, positioning, winning, and losing. Do not assume that you will earn a lot of admiration or love as a result of proper administration. An administrator spends a lot of time locating weaknesses and pointing them out. Weaknesses, one's own or those of others, do not like having themselves pointed out, and they will resent your acumen. Nevertheless, press on. One hopes to progress. As T.S. Eliot suggests in "East Coker,"

> *In order to arrive there,*
>
> *To arrive where you are, to get from where you are not, you must go by a way in which there is no ecstasy. In order to arrive at what you do not know you must go by a way which is the way of ignorance. In order to possess what you do not possess you must go by the way of dispossession.*
>
> *In order to arrive at what you are not you must go through the way in which you are not. And what you do not know is the only thing you know. And what you own is what you do not own. And where you are is where you are not.*

THE PRODUCER IN THE COLLEGE THEATRE

Philip Hill

The duties of the producer in the New York theatre are widely understood. The producer is the person who purchases performance rights to a script, employs the director and the other creative staff, rents a theatre, manages budgets, promotion, and box office, and generally assumes managerial control over the entire process of staging a play. For the most part, the producer delegates to the director full artistic control over all aspects of production, but retains a tight hold on the purse strings. Outside of New York, and in theatre organizations other than commercial, there is far less agreement on who the producer is, where the authority of a director stops, or, in the simplest terms, who is in charge. Nowhere is this lack of clarity in organizational structure more pervasive than in college theatre departments.

That there is confusion on this matter is readily apparent to anyone browsing through the leading textbooks in directing, in theatre management, and in introduction to theatre. Brockett suggests that, in educational theatres, "the group is the producer and the duties may be divided among many persons."[1] Sievers, *et. al.*, state flatly, "In the educational theatre there is as a rule no producer."[2] Clifford says that the producer is "the president on the college and university level."[3] Staub probably comes closer to reality when he says, "Outside of New York, the usage in professional, community, and educational theatre is for one member of the directing staff to assume the title of managing director, combining the responsibilities of both the director and the producer."[4] Interestingly, most directing texts seems not to get into this question at all, prefering to leave vague the point at which the director's authority stops. Most introduction to theatre texts define the producer's job in a New York context, but have little to say about these matters outside New York, often hiding in a blurred distinction between the producing organization and the producer as an individual.

Certainly the whole college or university, as the only corporate entity involved, may be described as a "producer," but in practical terms the theatre department (or its equivalent, if it exists as a part of another academic department) is the producing organization and the head of that department is the producer. When the theatre department is functioning like other academic departments, it is composed of professional colleagues who may agree to disagree and who may teach their own classes as they see fit, whereas when that same department is functioning as a producing organization there is a hierarchical structure that is inherent in any theatrical enterprise and that must be understood if the producing organization is going to function smoothly. Sometimes the department head delegates responsibility to a managing director or director of theatre, but, under whatever title, the person in charge is the producer, and his or her duties are remarkably analogous to those of the New York producer. Thus, whether the producer is the department head or a person to whom the department head has delegated this responsibility, full responsibility for, and authority over, the producing organization rests with that individual.

In an organization accustomed to the collegiality of academic relationships, how is this authority to be exercised? Normally, it happens with the tacit consent of all concerned, since the director and the design staff are normally given wide latitude for artistic decisions and usually understand all too well the constraints of the budget under which they, as well as the producer, must work. But what of the moments when tacit consent does not occur? What happens when there are disagreements, and how are such disagreements to be resolved? Most such disagreements are subject to quick and easy resolution or need never occur in the first place, if there exists a widely shared agreement with respect to organizational structure. In short, everyone must understand where the buck stops. An analogy between the New York producer and the producer in the college theatre will help to explain the functions--and limitations--of the latter.

Most theatre departments give the individual directors a great deal of latitude in the selection of scripts that they would like to direct. This is important, for directors cannot do their best work if they are staging scripts that they do not like. Nevertheless, it is the function of the producer to assemble the wishes of the several directors into a season of plays that meets the overall needs of the program. The producer must at least be able to reject some selections and encourage others until a balanced season emerges--a season balanced between old and new, foreign and

domestic, classic and experimental, serving the educational needs of the students who will be working on the plays as well as those who will be attending them. Even where income earned at the box office is not significant in financing the program, an audience must still be attracted if meaningful theatre is to exist. It is the producer's function to shape a season that will meet these needs, to secure performance rights for producing the plays selected, and to schedule the use of the theatre or theatres in which the plays will be performed.

Just as the wise New York producer leaves artistic decisions to the director and the artistic staff, so the college producer normally leaves such decisions to the director and the several designers. The producer may very well schedule production meetings, however, to insure that the necessary communication is occurring among the several staff members assigned to the show. As artistic decisions emerge from these meetings, the producer can evaluate their cost and urge alternative solutions if necessary to keep total production costs within budgetary limitations. If disagreements arise within the artistic staff, the producer will seek ways to resolve these differences, usually by insisting that the judgments of the director must prevail at least until that director's show is on the boards. In the unfortunate event that a staff member fails to meet his responsibility, it will be the producer who will see that someone else is assigned to fulfill that responsibility or that other arrangements are made so that the show not only goes on, but is mounted at the very best level of which the organization is capable.

The producer is directly responsible for publicity, promotion, box office operation, house management, and the other aspects of operating the front of the house. Since these activities are integrated into a season-long plan, they cannot effectively be superintended by the director of each individual play. Where the director's production concept leads to good ideas for publicity, these ideas are normally welcome and can be introduced into the overall publicity plan, but usually an individual director does not have refusal rights over publicity releases, poster designs, and other aspects of promoting the show in the same way that he does over scenery, lighting, and costumes. The director and the artistic staff are responsible for preparing a show and having it ready to present to the public at a specific date and time. The business staff (overseen by the producer) are responsible for marketing that show: for attracting an audience to the theatre, for insuring their safety and comfort while they are in the theatre, and for encouraging them to return for future productions.

Even in the best-run organizations, disagreements do from time to time occur. Sometimes an unexpected expense well beyond what the budget will allow is so important to the director that it seems worth sacrificing something later in the season to accommodate it. Sometimes honest and well-intentioned artists find themselves completely at loggerheads, so totally committed to differing approaches to a show that no compromise seems possible. Sometimes temperaments fray, tempers flare, and personality conflicts loom so large that constructive work on a show threatens to grind to a halt. When these difficult moments occur, it is the producer who must resolve them. No longer does the individual director have the kind of perspective that will allow for a reasoned weighing of all the factors involved. The producer must consider not only the show at hand, but also the overall program of which it is a part, and must insure that each director will have a reasonable measure of artistic freedom and creative possibility within which to mount future plays. In these cases, then, the buck stops at the producer's desk, and a decision sometimes has to be made that infringes on the usual prerogatives of other staff members.

A theatre department is like an English department of a speech department in that it is composed of a group of scholars who meet occasionally on a collegial basis to decide on common approaches to mutual problems, and then separate to teach their own classes as they see fit. A theatre department also is like a professional producing theatre, in that, within a well defined hierarchical structure, it produces plays and sells them to the public. The former mode of operation is traditionally and fiercely democratic, whereas a producing theatre is inherently (though perhaps benevolently) autocratic. Finally, therefore, any theatre department head wears two hats: the academic hat when presiding as one among academic colleagues, and the producer's hat when functioning as the chief executive of a producing theatre. Wise indeed is the department head who can always keep in mind which hat is being worn.

Endnotes

[1]Oscar G. Brockett, *The Theatre: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1969), p. 390.
[2]W. David Sievers, *et. al.*, *Directing for the Theatre*, 3rd ed. (Dubuque, 1974), p. 11.
[3]John E. Clifford, *Educational Theatre Management* (Skokie, Illinois, 1972), p. 60.
[4]August W. Staub, *Creating Theatre* (New York, 1973), pp. 326-327.

THE THEATRE ADMINISTRATOR IN THE 80s

Vera Mowry Roberts

What does the future hold for theatre programs in our American colleges and universities? Futurism is certainly a popular pastime these days, but it can hardly be called an exact science. The findings of the 1980 census are generating a host of predictions for the future in many and various fields. In fact, there is a whole industry of futurism. One of the most interesting methods for predicting the future comes from an organization that clips hundreds of newspapers over a period of time and produces future trends based on an elaborate system of cross-references of "mentions" and on the number of lines devoted to various news stories. Thus, the past becomes the prophet of the future--a process which we humanists and theatre historians have long known to be true.

What will be the shape of theatre studies for the 80s? What kinds of programs will the theatre administrator have to administer? How can that administrator be prepared for--and possibly influence--the shape of programs in the 80s?

We have all heard two basic predictions: (1) college enrollments will decline in the 80s, and (2) traditional sources of money will dry up. From these broad (if inaccurate) predictions a host of others spring: (1) Theatre studies, being among the most recent to come to academic respectability, will no doubt be the most vulnerable and therefore the "first to go"--the seniority principle. (2) Theatre studies being among the most expensive of the disciplines, (by reason of the inherent production component), will be among the first to be cut--the cost-effective principle. (3) Shrinking enrollments mean shrinking faculties; hence no "new blood" will be able to suffuse the programs, and they will die--the atrophy-by-tenure principle. (4) Small departments and/or programs will disappear entirely and the larger ones will shrink--the diminishing-returns principle. (5) The current undergraduate emphasis on vocational training means a precipitous drop in theatre enrollments because there are no jobs--the "I-have-to-make-a-living-don't-I" principle.

The list could go on and on - - - - - -

A hundred years ago Lawrence Lowell, witnessing the proliferation of learned societies in this country, said that scholars stood to lose by these subdivisions, just as the crafts had, by then, lost to industrialization. I wonder what he would say how to the fragmentation of knowledge and the proliferation of departments within the current scene in American higher education? Over the last twenty or thirty years, theatre folk have been so busy declaring their uniqueness, their specialness, their apartness, that a great many other folk are ready to take them at their word and lop off that esoteric branch of the tree of knowledge.

Since the battle for academic recognition has long since been won on most college campuses, and academic credit is now almost awarded for theatre studies, it is time for reintegration-- but in a particular and special way. First, theatre educators must insist upon --and demonstrate--that the study of theatre is not to be limited to the chosen few, but is absolutely the best avenue for a humanistic education, comprising as it does the study of aesthetics, history, language and literature, the other arts, social policy, and cultural dynamics. Theatre faculties--led by their administrators--must make connections with these other disciplines. One of the easiest ways, of course, is to get college-wide acceptance of a basic theatre course into the general humanities curriculum. This arrangement also raises the department FTE and allows for smaller classes on the upper division levels. But offering to teach in the comparative literature program, the general literature program, the music and dance programs, the visual arts programs, etc--or inviting faculty from those disciplines to teach in the theatre program--entwines the theatre program into the very warp and woof of the college and makes it an indispensable part of its fabric. Can acting students do scenes for literature classes? For history classes? For education classes? Can departments fully cooperate in public presentations? Not just the usual music and theatre for opera and musicals, but classics? English? architecture? sociology? urban affairs? The success of a recent symposia series on the "City and the Theatre" is still a pleasant remembrance. The concept of alliances in teaching as well as in production, while always fruitful for demonstrating the indispensibility of theatre studies, is particularly useful to those one-to-three person programs whose future seems so uncertain. Teaching alliances allow us to use interested and able faculty from other disciplines to lighten the load of the full-time theatre faculty, to expand theatre offerings, and to give the college faculty as a whole a stake in the future of the theatre program. Second, we may have to

rethink present departmental configurations and alliances. What is a good size for an academic department? What size will allow its members to take their places comfortably on all-college committees, for instance? Can the weight of a small theatre program be increased by its being a part of a larger complex? If so, with whom should it seek affiliation-- with the other performing arts? With speech communication? With one or the other of the humanities? The answer will depend on the particular circumstances on a given campus.

Just the other day a colleague of mine in another artistic discipline declared, "We are educators first and artists second," being himself an artist of some distinction. But he had something there. The artist/teacher is interested not primarily in her or his fulfillment as an artist but in developing the talents and abilities of the student. The artist teacher gets primary satisfaction from that development and will use her or his creative imagination in a variety of ways to further the total education of each new generation of students.

Does the production "tail" (forgive me!) wag the theatre program dog? Do not let it. If your campus theatre program is expected to serve the community, let the community serve the program, too. Find those non-college persons and organizations that can aid and enhance what you do: Junior Leagues, senior clubs, service organizations, community theatres, experimental theatres, regional theatres, and tap them for audience-building, fund-raising, studetn internships, unique and specialized teaching, special acting roles or design competencies. Use them and you make your theatre program an integral part not only of the college community but also of the community at large.

All of this cooperation requires a certain self-less-ness and a great deal of imagination and communication as well. But it is honest and sound as an educational endeavor. To my mind, it is absolutely ridiculous to pretend that the thousands of theatre programs that exist across this country are preparing their students for entry into the traditional world of professional theatre. There are not enough places in that world, despite its continuing expansion, even if all students were supremely talented. But new areas are opening up: arts and the handicapped, arts therapies, arts and senior citizens, arts in recreation, arts in aids in general education. Career opportunities are bound to expand in these emerging areas. The conscientious theatre faculty member must open these possibilities to the starry-eyed students. Thus, the growing vocational emphasis can be met honestly.

Declining enrollments? Based on my observation, although I have not made a scientific study, enrollments in arts programs have not declined in the same proportion as college enrollments in general. In my opinion, they are not likely to do so. Much is made these days about preparation for second careers--particularly for women returning to the job market after several years of marriage. Futurists predict this trend will continue, and theatre programs need to be aware of it.

Funds drying up? I long ago disabused my mind of the notion that to make a case once was sufficient and that thereafter everybody would recognize my program's worth and consequence, Cases have to be made over and over again, in many different ways to many different audiences--just as one has to prove oneself over and over again in theatre production itself. And certainly making one's program indispensible to the college and the community will ease the pressure on fund-seeking. More efficient use of funds, faculties, and facilities will be more and more necessary in the coming years. Why not rent out facilities when you are not using them? Or trade them for in-kind services?

What am I saying? About the only thing that is certain about the future is that it will be different from the present and the past. You may all groan while I repeat the old saw that the only permanent thing is change. What will the future require? A new point of view. Imagination. Adaptability. Risk-taking. Seizing opportunities. Thinking through new problems. Sizing up one's strengths and playing to them.

One of the most discouraging aspects to me in the last presidential campaign was the constant reiteration by the man elected President that we should--and could-- "go back to the good old days." I am ashamed that any theatre person should think that to be possible. But then, he is primarily film, isn't he? Even so! Thomas Wolfe was more than right when he said, "You can't go home again." The 80s will bring a host of challenges--of that I am certain. But none of them will be oeverwhelming if we remain flexible, imaginative and keep our objectivity and our sense of humor.

THEATRE ADMINISTRATION FOR THE 1980s: STRATEGIES FOR PROGRAM CLARITY

Greg Kunesh

One of the aims of this paper is to look at what I view as both an ethical and professional responsibility -- that we reflect on what we are doing, what effect it is having, and how we might improve whatever it is that we do. I also should like to raise questions that may lead to some administrative and curricular improvements.

When we look at the current status of arts administration, and of theatre administration specifically, we are faced with a striking lack of clarity, and lack of consensus regarding our present status. We are coming out of the period of affluence of the sixties and early seventies, an affluence reflected in new buildings, increased enrollments, expanded programs, increased budgets, and enlarged faculties. Much excellence resulted from that growth. Only recently, however, have we begun to see that other effects that the period had. It was a period of affluence in which it was easy to be supportive of the arts, but that period is behind us, and another like it may not come until near the end of the century. In many ways we were so wrapped up with the short-term needs of that period, that we failed to plan for long-term needs. Now, those old "long-term" needs have become our present short-term problems.

While many of us are not facing immediate problems, we can see what is happening in other parts of the country, and we should recognize what the signs mean. Education, and arts education particularly, may be in for an extremely bleak decade. The recent decision to cut by almost half the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts could have an enormous effect on all of us. Our colleagues talk more about their personal savings from the recent tax cut than about their concern over extensive cuts in support of the arts. And while we have indeed seen increased budgets and salaries, I question if the total budgets alloted to the arts have maintained the share of total budget that was allotted only a few years ago.

Let me offer some administrative strategies to these warning signs. Their numerical ordering represents an attempt at organization rather than a listing of priorities. While the list is not comprehensive, it does cover what I believe to be our most pressing problems.

Strategy I: We need to guide ourselves and our faculties through the sometimes painful process of self analysis toward clearly defined mission statements, program goals, and program definition.

Too many of our programs try to be all things for all people. Because of gradual growth and development, or because "that's the way we were broght up," we accept the notion that all theatre programs should be like our theatre program. We must, however, keep asking such valid question as: Should all college and university theatre programs be degree-granting programs? Are an MFA program and a PhD program really compatible or in the best interest of both programs? Are we concerned with a liberal arts or a pre-professional training program? What is it we are really about and how can we best get there? Is there ever a necessity to hedge a little with these goals, and, if so, under what circumstances?

This strategy is the underpinning of all others. Unless a faculty collectively determines specific and clearly stated goals and mission statements, our individual programs can be only a holding company at best. Curriculum, recruitment, programs, needs analyses, and support arguments must all be based on this strategy.

Strategy 2: We need to develop a system of collecting and disseminating data that will help us in our arguments with central administration.

Our programs often defy a central administration's computer formulas, geared as they are to student-credit-hour production. We cannot limit ourselves to a comparison with math or English; we must compare ourselves to other theatre programs and to ourselves two years ago; we must ask what kinds of people are served by our production and/or service programs, how many people are served by our program, etc.

Augustin Girard in an article entitled "Cultural Indicators for More Rational Cultural Policy" states: *. . .it is no longer possible today to lay down policies on the basis of personal experience and the past only. If cultural development is to take its rightful place in relation to social and economic development, we must make cultural policy rational and objective. And cultural life is so deeply impregnated with intangible value; programs are still so lacking in clear and consistent aims, that this can only be done by the use of facts and figures obtained through recourse to the social sciences. . . What needs quantification is not culture, but facilities and resources.*

Could we not have a data pool designed and computerized to provide many of the data on facilities and resources increasingly

needed by each of us? Can we afford not to have such a data bank?

Strategy 3: We need to design a budgeting system that accurately reflects our "cost effeciency ratio" in a useful manner to our colleagues and to central administration.

Most university budgeting is based on an industrial economic model, which does not easily apply to the performing arts, and, when applied, is often detrimental to our programs. The formula for funding is geared almost exclusively to classroom and student-credit-hour productivity, to an instant analysis of departmental productivity, cost-efficiency indexes based on student head count, credit hour productivity per faculty FTE, and system-wide average unit cost (single credit hour produced) per faculty member in the unit. Whether we like it or not, such matters are becoming increasingly important to our budget allocations. Unless we learn the language and procedures of these systems we will be at their mercy.

At a time when costs are rising faster in the arts than elsewhere, it seems that we are placing ourselves in double jeopardy by blindly accepting present budgeting systems.

Strategy 4: We need to develop aggressive and sophisticated recruiting methods aimed at recognizing talent early and encouraging its continued development.

It seems doubly problematic that at the very time we are faced with the threat of decreasing enrollments, we also are hit with an increasing perception of the undesirability of the arts as a college major or as a professional career. These problems mean that not only must we compete with each other for potential students, but also that we must recognize talent and interest at an earlier age and then nurture them.

I believe one of the most effective means of accomplishing this is to develop more personal contacts with public schools and to assist our colleagues from the Secondary School Theatre Association as they try to upgreade certification requirements and curricular programs.

Stratety 5: We need to devise in-hour policies that recognize quality performances consistent with program goals, while at the same time encouraging professional growth and development.

During a time of budget cutbacks and enrollment decreases, faculty members become understandably anxious. Recognition of faculty accomplishment becomes very important in order to maintain healthy attitudes, creativity, and quality in the program.

Strategy 6: We need to devise a formula that will give us administrative recognition for audiences attending our productions.

I believe this is an important issue. For too long we have focused on production only from a departmental point of view; we have raised the question of faculty release time. But as I have already indicated under Strategy 3, our funding formula will have an impact on our program's production analyses and budget allocations.

My unit's faculty-per-student credit hour ratio is approximately 1 to 140, compared to that of some departments in arts and sciences with one of 1 to 425. Yet, when I build in an audience factor to that formula for our program, I come up with a potential ratio of 1 to 600. We should be able to persuade central administration to accept some version of this formula.

Strategy 7: We need to nurture the reliance shared by all of the art disciplines.

For too long we have myopically focused on only problems of theatre to the exclusion of similar problems in music and the visual arts. In fact, we all have a great deal in common, and we need to nurture that commonality if only to be able to make stronger collective arguments.

During the next decade I believe we are going to see many universities try to streamline cumbersome Colleges of Arts and Sciences. I strongly recommend the Fine Arts or Performing Arts College. A dean who is not only sympathetic but who understands and has made professional commitments to the arts can be of enormous help.

Strategy 8: We need to honor our discipline's long-standing commitment to quality education from elementary through graduate school.

Most of us have supported the need for strengthening programs in public schools and in higher education. During the past decade we have seen innumerable resolutions passed by the ATA, the Mid-American Assembly on the Future of the Performing Arts, the National Alliance for Arts Education, and the National Association of Schools of Theatre. We gather informally and reaffirm our support of these resolutions, then return home and do very little about them. It is imperative that we ask our Association to convince other organizations to take action in implementing our resolutions.

Strategy 9: We need to develop our audiences in both quality and numbers.

Audience development is an important obligation to our own program and to the future support of professional theatre. Increasingly, academic theatres may have to rely on box office receipts for an increased percentage of production costs. Audience development will take planning, careful season selection, and assertive marketing techniques.

Strategy 10: We need to lead our units toward greater service to both university and community.

We can no longer hide from our larger responsibilities. Our service courses will become increasingly important, and they will help both budget and audience development.

Strategy 11: We need to plan for the future of physical facilities.

It is sometimes much more difficult to maintain present equipment than it is to acquire new equipment. Our planning must include such needs and must develop priorities for both maintenance and acquisition.

Strategy 12: We need to make commitment to administration as our primary task.

Administration is becoming a total commitment. Our responsibilities are increasingly stretching outside the unit and even outside the university, with ever more demands from recruitment, audience development, external funding, and professional liaison with other programs and professional organizations. Administrators find it increasingly difficult to maintain commitment to teaching, research, and creative work. Choices must be made, and I believe that administration must be the top

priority.

Strategy 11: We need to be optimistic despite our problems. Perhaps this is most important of all. Because of our immediate problems, we may tend to lose sight of how far we have come.

As administrators, we are the guardians of "psychic rewards" for our faculty, staff, and students. If we are not positive and optimistic, how can we expect other to work at their best? I believe that our attitude sets the tone for the unit. If other strategies are followed, we have every reason to be optimistic. I sincerely believe we are in what could be one of the most challenging, creative, and rewarding periods of theatre and arts administration.

Endnote

[1]Augustine Girard, "Cultural Indicators For More Rational Cultural Policy," *Cultural Policy and Arts Administration*, ed., Stephen A. Greyser. (Boston: Harvard Summer School Institute in Arts Administration, 1973), pp. 124-125.

SMALL COLLEGE SOLUTIONS TO BIG PRODUCTION PROBLEMS: NEW GUIDELINES FOR THE YEARS AHEAD

William Grange

During the post-World War II era, colleges and universities throughout the United States experienced explosive growth in theatre acitivities on their campuses. At the larger state universities, theatre divisions, which had been attached to departments of English or speech, became full-fledged departments; these theatre departments began to offer graduate programs and to confer degrees at the master's and doctoral level. State-supported institutions of medium size, which had formerly been committed to the training of public school teachers, became universities in their own right and began to imitate their larger counterparts by installing theatre departments; these too continued to grow into departments which offered upper-level instruction and graduate degrees. Small colleges, for the most part privately supported liberal arts institutions, had a somewhat different experience: they usually had a faculty member in an English department who advised a dramatics club or who guided interested students in play selection and performance. During the decades after World War II, these small colleges began to offer courses in theatre as well, in some cases even creating departments with a major in the theatre arts. But in the main, these departments remained at the one-or-two person level.

Colleges and universities in the final two decades of the twentieth century now face the prospect of a trend that will move in the opposite direction. Instead of expansion, theatre departments are likely to experience a period of retrenchment, if not outright constriction. In fact, many departments are already reducing their course offerings and generally scaling down their operations. These circumstances are indeed a source of concern and sometimes dismay, but they are not cause for alarm. In order better to cope with the changes occurring in the educational theatre field, it would be a good idea to examine the theoretical base of educational theatre which guided departments in the past but which may no longer prove useful, and to look for new guidelines to aid departments in the future.

The principal theoretical base of educational theatre since World War II has been the same theory that motivated much of the professional theatre. This theory stated that diversity was a blessing, beneficial to students and desirable in even the smallest department. Much of the theory came from Brecht, who had insisted that diversity was essential to effective theatre. *let us invite all the sister arts of the drama,"* he said in 1949, *not in order to create an 'integrated work of art' in which they offer themselves up and are lost, but so that together with the drama they may further the common task in their different ways.* His argument was basically a rejection of Wagner's concept of the *Gesamtkunstwerk*, which Brecht considered redundant; unity caused all production elements to make the same impression, he said. He proposed that each element in a production should make its own contribution to the production; this notion presupposed an active audience, one which could immediately comprehend the ideas under discussion and could subsequently discern the "right" or "proper" solution to the problem presented. Brecht in fact encouraged contradiction among the various production elements, believing that lighting and costumes in juxtaposition, for example, would cause the audience to reconcile the discrepancy in its own mind, thereby becoming "involved" in the production.

Brecht's ideas took firm root in the larger theatre departments in the United States during the 1950s, 1960s, and well into the 1970s. But the plant which grew up in this environment was a curious hybrid. It was the "non-synthesized" production, one in which the various production elements were not only in juxtaposition, but actually in competition with each other. This reflected the burgeoning growth of the areas within the theatre department. Immediately after World War II, it was not uncommon to find a single faculty member responsible for set, lighting and costume design for a production. As enrollments increased, so did the number of faculty members, each with competing claims upon the artistic direction of a production. In a theoretical instance, imagine a new lighting designer who, wishing to impress his chairman and colleagues or to make a special point with his students, creates a design which incorporates the latest ideas in cross-fading. Also assume that the cross-fades work perfectly, the audience is impressed with them, and the chairman puts a note in the new lighting designer's confidential file, resulting in a raise at the end of the year. The fact that the cross-fades had little to do with the director's overall production concept caused little concern, since the "overall production concept" was so general in the first place. It had to be in order to absorb not only the lighting designer's new ideas, but those of the costumer, the set designer, and the sound designer as well. Given the competition among design ideas, a

director is compelled to compromise, personal ideas. Perhaps, in this theoretical department, the director was outranked by the designers; perhaps it was his or her first year, too. And, perhaps that person did not wish to make waves within the department, thus following a policy of acquiescence.

In some cases, the director's acquiescence had a pedagogical premise. If a department had graduate design students, perhaps a student was assigned to the production for the completion of a thesis project and entitled to a degree of autonomy. As a designer, the student knew his concept must be in accord with the director's concept; but the design student had more than one master to please. Not only was he working for the production's director, he was trying to satisfy the demands of the graduate committee in general, and of the thesis advisor in particular. Sometimes, the concept proposed by the director did not meet with the advisor's endorsement. The graduate student then found himself caught in the middle of a faculty conflict with the subsequent result that the production suffered from a lack of strong direction and percipient integration, not to mention the discomfiture of the graduate student caused by the delay of graduation plans, and the stifling of creativity essential to the successful completion of a thesis project.

Few in the large department might have deemed the conflict unfortunate; most would have overlooked the production's diffuseness with the notion that it lived up to the Brechtian concept of "diversity." But this was a concept which some theatre departments had accommodated for themselves: Brecht had indeed adumbrated a theatre which placed production elements in juxtaposition to one another, but he did not have an educational theatre in mind when he did so. Few audiences at university theatre productions, although they were growing in sophistication and taste, were ready to "involve" themselves ("alienate" is the most traditional word) in the matter Brecht intended.

The kind of diversity which developed over the years in large university theatre departments, therefore, contradicted goals of undergraduate educational theatre; large programs in design, acting, and directing may have begun to provide professional training for graduate students, but in many cases they overlooked the needs of undergraduates. And it was to benefit undergraduate education that most theatre departments initially came into being. Hubert C. Heffner had the clearest understanding of theatre as a pedagogical instrument when he stated that a liberal education was a "liberating education," a few disciplines could match the liberating experience an undergraduate major in theatre arts provided. The theatre incorporated the studies of language, philosophy and ethics, he said; courses in stagecraft, lighting, and design provoked students to exercise their ability to reason logically and to arrive at supportable conclusions. These courses, along with courses in performance, analysis of drama, and theatre history, accomplish what the Greeks, along with Heffner, considered to be an important synthesis, namely the fusion of intuitive imagination with intellectual reasoning.[2]

Theatre was, thus, a valid study for many students who might never come near any experience in professional theatre. Attempts by theatre departments to provide professional training, or even worse, mount what they considered "professional" productions, frequently flew in the face of the stated goal of educating undergraduates. Professional training programs had obvious benefits for graduate students, but what about the inexperienced sophomore who had no idea what the production's lighting had to do with the play's overall concept? What about the costume he wore in the third act with the strangely colored sash? Why did it have that strange color anyway? He had asked the director, and the director informed him that the costume designer felt it was "right" for the character. "Right" it no doubt was; in fact, it was probably brilliant. So were the lights he stood in during another scene. But did that help the sophomore to understand the play any better? Did that help him to comprehend the production to a deeper extent? More succinctly phrased, did that sophomore learn anything from his experience in this production?

If college students in the 1980s and 1990s are to enroll in theatre department courses, they must be convinced that they will derive some educational benefit for their time and money. If their experience is anything like the aforementioned sophomore's, they will probably conclude that the effort is not worth it. They will find it worthwhile, however, if they find themselves cast in a production which does not emphasize diversity but rather in one which espouses integration under the leadership of a director with a wide and varied theatre background. The preference for integration, and for such a director, was professed by Gordon Craig. Integration was the basis for the art of the theatre, which he defined as *neither the acting nor the play, it is not the scene not the dance, but it consists of all the elements of which these things are composed.*[3] However, Craig characterized the director who integrated the elements as one analogous to the conductor of an orchestra, a conductor who was extremely familiar with every instrument in that orchestra--a "master craftsman" to use Craig's words. He should be a director who has "mastered the uses of actions, words, line, color, and rhythm."[4]

Directors in small college theatre departments have perforce become the kind of master craftsmen Gordon Craig had in mind. In the small, private colleges, theatre departments did not always experience the kind of growth witnessed on university campuses. Their audiences and students, however, became sophisticated to the point that they demanded productions with interesting scenery, lighting, and costuming. Responsibility for fulfilling the demands of audiences and students fell upon the faculty members involved in mounting productions, and if the college was fortunate enough to have a theatre department, it usually had only one or two members. These faculty members customarily had to mount three or four productions per year. To meet this challenge, the person in charge had to recruit students or community volunteers to rummage through wardrobe collections, buy props from the local K-Mart, build sets late into the night, and hang lights on the afternoon before opening night. These brave and valiant efforts left the director at the end of the year, after four productions, completely exhausted.

But strange things began to happen after two or three years of such zealous activity: the director began to assume characteristics of Craig's artist in the theatre. He had learned to master "the uses of actions, words, line, color, and rhythm."

The development of the artist in the theatre at small colleges during the post-World War II era has had salutary pedagogical effects as well, for the director of any undergraduate production is a teacher as well as a director. Much of the time undergraduates become "actors" in plays at the college level with very little instruction behind them. The director finds himself in the role of vocal and movement coach, while trying to impress upon his charges the importance of subplots in Shakespeare, of multiple character motivation in Strindberg, or of imagery in Tennessee Williams. While the director is explaining imagery, he also can call upon his lighting design to help in the explanation. He also can refer to the costume he found the night before to help the young woman playing Masha in *The Seagull* to understand why the character is "in mourning for her life." It is indisputable that large departments could produce superior costumes, props, and lighting designs; whether or not their productions would be superior in a pedagogical sense is open to question. Certainly the director who also is the designer is in a position to become a better teacher. He can give a fuller, more well-rounded approach to the theatre, and his small department is in a better position to produce students whose multiple talents can serve in numerous production areas.

The fact that we are facing retrenchment should be viewed as an opportunity to mount integrated productions, whose objective is clear to every student involved. The fact that there may not be a full-time (or even part-time) costumer on the staff even allows opportunity for small colleges to ease the pinch in the job market for recent graduates of large university programs: at Florida Southern College, for example, the Theatre Arts Department hired a costumer for a five-week period, during which she designed and helped build costumes for two different productions. This kind of employment is of course no substitute for a regular, full-time faculty appointment, but it is a favorable alternative to unemployment for a graduate student. Small college departments have for years sought to solve problems caused by lack of money or shortage of staff; they have encouraged and used student designers; they have built unit sets; they have stretched dollars in every imaginable way. The solutions they have found should be a guide to everyone in the educational theatre as we attempt to find our way through what is left of the twentieth century.

Endnotes

[1]Bertolt Brecht, *Kleines Organon fur das Theater* (Potsdam: publisher unknown, 1949), p. 67. The translation and emphasis are my own.

[2]Hubert C. Heffner, "Theatre and Drama in a Liberal Education," in *Studies in Theatre and Drama*, ed. Oscar G. Brockett (The Hague: Mouton, 1972), p. 17.

[3]Edward Gordon Craig, *On the Art of the Theatre* (London: Heinemann, 1911), p. 138.

[4]*Ibid*, p. 172.

RETRENCHMENT AND REVIVAL

Patti P. Gillespie

Retrenchment during the 1980s is, I believe, inevitable. The only question, then, is who will supervise the retrenchment and with what result. My argument is that the departmental faculties should themselves supervise the retrechment and that their goal should be the revival of excellence. In order to make my argument, I must first set forth my assumptions about educational theatre and my analysis of the historic circumstances that have brought us to our present situation. Because I know university theatres best, I shall use them as a model, but with appropriate modifications, my observations should hold true for two-and four-year colleges as well.

University programs in theatre have four major responsibilities.

The first is to serve as a cultural center fo the university and surrounding community. This responsibility is met primarily through the public performances, the pattern of which therefore should be carefully controlled. As a general rule, a student who attends productions regularly should be able to see all major forms, styles, and historic periods of the drama during his/her four-year college career.

A second obligation is to provide instruction for the general student, whose goal is to understand (rather than to practice) the art. This responsibility is met principally by means of lower-division, general courses that stress the humanistic dimensions of the art. The focus in such courses is on theatre as a human endeavor, theatre as a integral part of the social fabric in which it appears. One major goal of most such courses is to prepare more knowledgeable and tolerant audiences, those willing to enjoy a wide variety of plays.

A third obligation is to provide instruction for those relatively few students who wish to become artists or scholars in the field (and who are qualified to do so). This responsibility is met primarily by means of upper-division and graduate courses that are highly specialized. Offered alone, however, such courses are inadequate. They must be coupled with careful and honest academic counseling, for not every person wanting to become an actor has the basic tools necessary to practice the craft, and not every person aspiring to be a scholar has the intellectual ability to succeed. Forthright evaluations are thus a necessary part of all academic counseling.

The fourth and final obligation of university programs of theatre is to provide opportunities for the faculty to continue professional growth. This obligation requires not only that the department offer time and support for the faculty to pursue independent research and writing or, as its equivalent, artistic work of unmistakably high quality, but also that all members of the faculty must be committed to such professional development. Let it be stressed that independent research in this context does not mean simply keeping up with the field or preparing fresh lectures, and artistic work does not mean simply putting on plays. The former may be suitable for high-school teachers and the latter for participants in community theatre, but, for institutions of higher learning the obligation is much more demanding: it requires a genuine contribution to the field of theatre -- its art, craft, theory, history, and so on.

Obviously, programs differ in the emphasis that they place on each goal. Indeed, much of the variety among theatre programs rests on that difference in emphasis. Nonetheless, all university theatres must meet all four obligations to some extent.

The problem is, of course, that these four goals often compete against rather than compliment one another. In times of growth--when students and money are plentiful--the competing goals present little threat, for there are funds and personnel to devote to each. In times of retrenchment, however, when both money and students are in short supply, fulfilling all four obligations can place severe strains on a program.

Although this general problem of balancing competing interests has long been present, it recently has been exacerbated by two circumstances, the consequences of which might be viewed as our legacy from the 1960s.

First, the growth of regional theatres and the revitalization of the New York theatre during the decade of the 1960s made an increasing number of young people hopeful about finding work in the expanding theatre market. Although encouraged, they were nonetheless mindful of the competition in the profession. Some were mindful, as well, of the Vietnam draft. These new students flocked to unversity departments of theatre where once they would have entered a professional academy, sought an apprenticeship, gone to New York, or simply chosen another profession. Such new students were often uninterested in education; they desired only training. They chose universities rather than professional schools or apprenticeships

only as a way "to keep their options open." They hoped that the university might serve as a stepping stone to the professional work they sought; but if they failed as professionals, they reasoned, they could always "fall back on teaching."

As such students flooded into universities, theatre departments found themselves subjected to new pressures. They found themselves increasingly torn between the needs of students seeking only a job in the professional theatre and those seeking a more traditional education.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, when money was plentiful and hopes were high, this new tension was most often handled by instituting two separate tracks: one for those with aspirations as professionals and another for those with aspirations as teacher/scholars. Although the stresses were often fierce, most university departments found it possible, with slight adjustments on a course-by-course basis, to accommodate both sets of students.

Second, during the 1960s when money and students were readily available, new schools sprang up nationwide, and old schools added new courses and new programs at a dizzying rate. As a part of this general expansion, theatre programs and degrees sprang up willy-nilly. This proliferation was largely uncontrolled, for the field, nationwide, had failed to establish minimum requirements for accreditation--or even to agree on standards. The unhappy result was that schools could add theatre programs with neither the faculty nor the facilities to support them. They could institute degrees, both graduate and undergraduate, that were ill-defined and that often lay quite outside the abilities and experiences of their faculty. Students at such institutions would, of course, be robbed of their proper education and training. Worse still, they might be led to believe that they were qualified in theatre, only to discover upon graduation that the field had no room for anyone with their meagre ability and training. Worst of all, they might never discover how faulty their own instruction had been, and thus passed along their misinformation to others.

Probably a satisfactory solution to these exciting problems of growth would have been found had the money held up.

But along came the 1970s and with them the realization that both students and money were in very short suppply. Only then did educational leaders begin to look about and see what the excesses of the 1960s had wrought. Some established departments were still fighting to stabilize an uneasy equilibrium among competing goals and diverse student populations when suddenly they found themselves competing with new programs that had sprung up during the era of easy money. Some new programs suddenly discovered that they were without enough students and without enough funds.

But even these hardships might have produced healthy competition, had all the programs fought to improve quality as a means of attracting students. Unhappily, no such committment to upgrading emerged, for yet another unexpected change took place. The formula for awarding funds shifted. Increasingly, for purposes of funding, programs were evaluated not on the reputation of their faculty, not on the excellence of their facilities, and not on the placement of their graduates. They were funded instead on the number of students enrolled in their classes.

With such an enrollment-driven model, the incentive of the small schools to develop quality gave way to the need to attract students. The incentive of large schools to maintain quality gave way to their need to retain students. Thus, at the very time that established departments were fighting to overcome the centrifugal force of competing internal interests and to educate the new students descending upon them, they found themselves increasingly in competition with the new programs. These new programs, in turn, were often still weak and ill-defined, but they were themselves being forced by tight money to abandon the pursuit of excellence in order merely to survive.

It is at this historical juncture that we find ourselves now. We are a field still without clear standards, without successful accreditation, and with a large number of programs of widely varying quality. What will the 1980s bring? I am prepared to speculate. First, internal tensions caused by competing goals and divided student interests will continue to increase because funds and people will get scarcer and career preparation will receive more emphasis throughout the academic world. Second, the competition among programs of theatres nationwide will probably intensify because of a major decline in student population (a predicted decline that has not yet materialized -- probably because of the general economic slowdown). In short, the 1980's will bring retrenchment.

Obviously, a retrenchment fueled by internal tensions, external competition, and enrollment-driven funding invites mediocrity. This condition is not conducive to the voluntary raising of standards, and the belated attempt of the American Theatre Association to establish accreditation will fail, in my opinion, for the timing is wrong: money is simply not now available for upgrading weak programs. As we all know, mediocrity, once established, tends to perpetuate itself. Mediocre but entrenched faculties do not willingly vote themselves out of a job, nor do they have the wit or inclination to attract and hold excellent new faculty members. Indeed, often they seem quite unable to distinguish between mediocrity and excellence.

The bleakest scenario for the 1980s, then, is one in which more and more programs--in a search for students -- sink into the sludge of mediocrity. In such programs, departmental faculties will abrogate their responsibilities and cave in to what they will call "the realities of the market place." They will decide that since money depends on students, they will attract and retain students at any cost. They will admit all who apply. They will nurture, but not evaluate. They will be loving and warm but not stern and honest. They will become drinking companions but not research partners for their students. They will continue to offer the widest possible range of courses and degrees, even when they are no longer able to teach them. And they

will graduate all students who put in time.

Because these faculties will demand nothing of their students, they will soon demand nothing of themselves. They will not publish; they will put on plays. They will not work professionally; they will offer their services to the local beauty pageant. They will not debate controversial issues in the field; they will quietly reach consensus. Cordiality will replace merit as a basis for promotion. Before long, the entire faculty will be happy, fat, lazy, and tenured. They will soon be able to congratulate themselves on having a contented faculty and a placid student body. Their ill-prepared graduates, lulled by the pleasantness of it all, will become teachers somewhere and will encourage their students to attend the old alma mater, where the cycle can begin anew.

By the time the 1990s arrive, this theatre faculty will be at the cutting edge of the realistic theatre of the 1950s.

Another scenario is possible, however. Retrenchment need not inevitably bring mediocrity. Retrenchment can result in a revival of excellence if only educational leaders will demand excellence.

In the first place, the scarcity of resources may well eliminate the weakest programs. Thus, resources and personnel now being siphoned off by them can return to support stable programs. By lopping off the weakest, the quality of the average can be raised. The result could be fewer, but generally better, programs.

Second, although the belated attempt to establish accreditation will fail, the attempt will focus attention on hard questions that were not asked during the era of easy money. Questions like: Why do we exist? How do our programs compliment others in our geographic area? across the nation? Are we making a contribution within our area? to the discipline as a whole? When our resources decline to the point that we can no longer do everything, what should we do? Which degrees should we continue to offer? Which curricula should we eliminate? Do we really need to offer an undergraduate major? an MFA? in every specialization? What would happen if our entire program were simply eliminated? Such questions, honestly asked and honestly -- even brutally -- answered should result in fewer courses, fewer degrees, and fewer programs; but again the courses and degrees remaining should be stronger and better.

Third, if the faculty decides that quality rather than numbers will guide its program, then the faculty rather than the computer will drive the choices of admissions, courses, curricula, and degrees. Obviously, I am not so naive as to believe that merely wishing to be excellent will result in excellence. I am convinced, however, that a conscious decision to seek quality rather than quantity can upgrade any program, simply because that single guiding decision will produce a very different pattern of subsequent, secondary decisions. To illustrate, let us consider a single fictitious case.

A small, private university devoted to the liberal arts has a theatre program housed within a Department of Communications. With four faculty members, the program now offers the BA, BFA, and MA degrees. It produces four major shows each year and supports about ten student productions. This theatre unit unexpectedly suffers both a cut in operating budget and the loss of its only non-tenured position. The remaining three faculty now have a choice: (1) they can continue the present program, or (2) they can cut back.

If their goal is numbers, they will probably decide to continue their present program, with the three reamining faculty agreeing to pick up the extra work.

The quality of what they do will inevitably suffer. Each faculty member will occasionally have to teach out of field, but there will be no time to prepare adequately. Each person, too, will have to assume additional production responsibilities, and so there will be no time for professional growth. The result is certain to be a faculty whose own skill and knowledge stagnates. Although the faculty may think that their personal sacrifices and their willingness to assume extra burdens are in the best interests of their students, in fact these choices are sure to deprive students of adequate instruction in the classroom, in the performances, and in private counseling, because the instruction will necessarily be given by persons no longer growing as artists and scholars.

If the three remaining faculty members had decided that quality of instruction was their paramount goal, they would have chosen the other alternative.

They would decide to cut back. What they eliminated or reduced would be chosen in view of their area's needs, their university's goals, and their own particular strengths and weaknesses. A sensible step would appear to be the elimination of the BFA degree program, for it seems out of character with the rest of the university. Also, with its stress on the acquisition of skills, such pre-professional work is unusually expensive in terms of time and personnel, requiring intensive work in small groups. Without the BFA, the production program might well be reduced with no significant ill effects on the education of students pursuing the BA and the MA degrees. The faculty, if they had to teach out-of-field would at least have adequate time to prepare, and their own professional development could continue.

Obviously, students wanting a BFA degree would go elsewhere, reducing the total enrollment of the program. But those students remaining to pursue the BA or the MA degree would have the benefit of a well-prepared faculty with time to offer personal advice. Moreover, the faculty's advice would probably be valuable, since they would be abreast of the latest discoveries in the art and scholarship of the theatre. Thus, although the decision to eliminate the BFA would be painful, it would surely be the wiser course if excellence rather than numbers were sought.

Although examples could be multiplied, I believe the point is clear. Whether the retrenchment of the 1980s will bring mediocrity or revival depends, in large measure, on the faculty members themselves. To maintain a

theatre program of quality in a field whose national picture is so bleak will require a solid sense of purpose at the departmental level. It will require a faculty with the honesty to face the reality of cutbacks. It will require a faculty willing to support the best program for students even when that program deviates from their own specialty. And most important of all, it will require a faculty whose commitment to excellence is uncommonly high. These faculty members will continue their own professional development because they know that they cannot otherwise maintain excellence. They know as well that only by pushing themselves to the limits of their art and scholarship will they earn the right to push students to the limits of theirs. Knowing that creative dissent can produce creative solutions, faculties committed to excellence will vigorously argue changes in courses and curricula, for they will recognize that all such decisions lie at the heart of the educational enterprise. In such faculties, merit, not politics, will decide questions of promotion, and so those faculty who survive will be the best qualified among those hired.

By the time the 1990 arrive, this faculty will be lean, tough, and vigorous. It is in this sense that faculty members themselves determine whether the retrenchment of the 1980s will bring mediocrity or excellence.

It seems appropriate to close with a comment on the administrators' role in the revival. The major challenge of academic administrators for the 1980s will be to assemble and maintain a faculty capable of excellence. Having secured an excellent faculty, administrators should then assist it as it strives to ground the retrenchment in rational decisions about educational purposes. Administrators should not talk of specific managerial problems like budgets, FTEs, and demographic data but of general educational concerns like admissions, curricula, grading, and graduation. They should keep asking the hard questions and causing the faculty to consider a wide range of alternatives. They should entertain suggestions for eliminating some programs in order to enhance others and should encourage vigorous debate over goals. In short, the administrator should help the faculty guide its own retrenchment so that when the 1990s arrive -- and with them the increased enrollments that are projected -- they will find waiting for them some theatre programs of excellence -- programs that were toughened and polished by the hardships of the 1980s.

EVALUATING THEATRICAL DIRECTORS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Larry D. Clark

When colleges and universities set down expectations for faculty who want to be promoted, tenured, or have their salary increased, they nearly always give lip service to the phrase "or creative activity" in the same breath with a pronouncement about research and publication. Theatre teachers, who formed much of the army for the frustrating fight that brought about this attitude, are now faced with ever more demands to devise ways to evaluate creative activity in order to validate its equivalence with research and publication. Unfortunately, the profession has failed to promulgate generally accepted criteria or methods for accomplishing this task. Indeed, within the general area of creative theatre activity lie at least two sets of problems, one for the director and one for the designer. Since evaluating designers is akin to evaluating traditional visual artists, the methodology is more apt to be in place. This paper concentrates on the seemingly unique problem of evaluating the creative work of the theatrical director.

When we have attempted to evaluate directors in the past, we have usually asked visiting faculty from other campuses to attend performances and to prepare a written appraisal that personnel committees or deans can read when making decisions about the director. This process, while providing a piece of paper that administrators seem to need to validate the product, is fraught with pitfalls and so is increasingly mistrusted by those same administrators. In the first place, unless the evaluator knows precisely the conditions under which the artist worked and the goals of the institution's production program, a meaningful evaluation is next to impossible. Even when these conditions are well known, careful administrators are apt to want to know who the evaluators are and why their views of the work are trustworthy. The obvious possibility for cronyism discredits the entire process.

Actually, the evaluation of the theatrical director poses such a sticky problem because the nature of the activity negates its equivalance with research and publication. It simply will not fit. When a research project culminates in a publication, that decision is totally outside the control of the faculty researcher. Somebody else decides whether the project should be preserved and shared with the profession. Such is not the case with the production of a play. The play goes on, whether or not it is ready and whether or not anybody else believes it whould be "published."

This paper is not a plea for a jury system to decide whether educational theatre productions should be opened to the public. Indeed, such an idea is anathema to the artist and represents the most insidious kind of censorship, a censorship, by the way, that may in fact be at work in certain decisions not to publish scholarly articles. The example is presented here to illustrate the dilemma facing an administrator who tries to equate creative activity and research.

That we were forced to advocate this equivalence in the first place is unfortunate. Theatre artists should be evaluated on how well they teach and make theatre. Institutions that hire faculty with an expectation that they direct theatrical productions as a part of their responsibilities should be willing to promote, tenure, and reward those individuals for doing that job. By advocating this position, however, one suggests that most such activity falls in the teaching mode, not the research/publication mode, and that evaluating what a director does should follow a similar pattern. At most institutions, this means faculty colleagues and students have the responsibility to render a judgment on the teacher and on the product.

Seeing creative activity as teaching rather than research will not make the evaluation process any easier, but it will clarify the responsibility for carrying it out and suggest a few assumptions that might lay the groundwork for getting it accomplished. The acceptance of directing as a part of the teaching responsibilities of a faculty member, for instance, assumes that the institution has concluded not only that there are appropriate educational purposes to be accomplished in theatrical productions but also that it is educationally important to support a production program to provide the strategy and the resources for pursuing these purposes. These assumptions may appear to be simplistic, but are they? How many programs have carefully articulated these goals? And, more important, how many really consider the contribution a director makes to these goals when it comes time to reward that director? The necessary assumptions for evaluating a director do not stop here, of course. Even more important is an institutional decision, at least at the divisional or departmental level, about

whether, for students working in a theatrical production, the extent of new learning or the level of achievement is the primary concern. Only after such a decision can a basis for evaluating the director be established. Without it, evaluation will remain haphazard, subjective, and fraught with the kind of unspecified demands for excellence that frustrates rather than stimulates those who work in our educational theatre programs.

Of course some institutions will decide that theatrical directors, like other teachers and researchers, ought to undertake activities that would signify professional growth as well as recognition beyond the campus as a qualification for promotion to higher ranks, tenure, or both. In such instances, theatrical directors who are not inclined to write about their art or its history as a method of establishing their reputation ought to realize that additional creative work, in order to provide evidence of professional growth, should be accomplished either in a professional setting or in some outlet not connected with their primary instructional duties. Directors often use the argument that good directing requires research and that they, therefore, should be relieved of demands for publication. The same argument applies to good teaching. The question is whether the institution demands a broader recognition of faculty? If so, a concomitant demand that directing be accomplished in a professional company as demonstration of that recognition brings us closer to standards assumed for publications-- somebody other than the director has passed judgment on the quality of the director's creative ability.

Institutions (that is to say, administrators), as well as the discipline, need to change the way that they think if we are to solve the evaluation problem. Released time for directing goes without saying. If directing is a part of the instructional program and a part of the contractual duty of the professor, it must comprise a portion of the time the professor is expected to devote to the institution. The idea that a professor should donate directing on top of a full teaching load negates the entire assumption of the value of directing as a teaching activity, placing it in the nebulous category usually referred to as "service" in administrative jargon. "Service" is not ordinarily evaluated. It is often the hiding place for the professional committee member who attempts to mask an inability or unwillingness to publish. Our creative work deserves a better home. When institutions demand that professors of theatre establish national reputations, they also should be prepared to subsidize them. After all, for years they have provided laboratories, libraries, computer assistance, leaves with pay, research associates, released time for editing scholarly journals, and university presses to ensure that research is both accomplished and published. Institutions, thus, should find equivalent ways to support the theatre artist, and many institutions have done so by subsidizing professional theatre companies and by providing leaves with pay for directors who are hired to direct off campus.

The American Theatre Association has taken a step to assist in the problem of evaluating directors by publishing a standards document and encouraging the National Association of Schools of Theatre to incorporate as an accrediting, evaluative agency. When accreditation becomes important for educational theatre programs, the way the institution uses and evaluates creative work as a part of the promotion, tenure, and salary decisions will become an important check point in the accreditation of a program. Meanwhile, the American College Theatre Festival has been providing, by default, a mechanism for evaluating creative work. Because this particular kind of evaluation has never been the purpose of the Festival, we ought to avoid its involvement in institutional decision making. For those institutions that need off-campus peer evaluations of creative work, the University and College Theatre Association could organize a system to provide such assistance. They ought to involve the very best artistic minds in the profession and carry out the visitations so that the director being evaluated has no choice in the evaluator. This system does not eliminate the problem of evaluating in a vacuum, but it lessens the possibility for mutual back-scratching and places the reputation of the professional in the hands of its master teachers and directors. Perhaps the American Theatre Association's Commission on Standards and Accreditation ought to assist the profession by developing production standards to fit theatre programs with varying educational goals. ATA also can help us share our experiences in integrating the production program with the curriculum so that we can provide a united front in gaining administrative support for our work.

It is entirely possible that by rendering more careful judgment of our creative work, the level of accomplishment of our production programs will be greatly improved. Only then can we begin to shed the reputation for dilettantism and sloppy performances that has always plagued our discipline, a reputation many believe to have been reinforced by the evidence of a decade and a half of the American College Theatre Festival. The storms of budgetary retrenchments in higher education loom persistently on the horizon. If our profession is to weather them relatively unscathed, we must be willing to establish, and submit to, procedures and standards for careful evaluation of everything we do.

MORE QUESTIONS ABOUT "NON-ACADEMIC" CREATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THEATRE

Alvin Goldfarb

There continues to be a debate over the expectation of off-campus theatre activity for instructors in theatre departments. In his recent article, "Evaluating Faculty Creative Production," Robert E. Davis supports the proposition that off-campus creative activities in broadcasting, film, and theatre are comparable to major research undertakings.[1] According to James W. Gibson and David L. Jorns in "Criteria for Faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Salary Adjustment: A Survey of U.S. College and Universities," *the adoption of creative work as a substitute for professional publication is widespread and constitutes, in many cases, the basis for professional decisions regarding promotion and tenure.*[2] While Gibson and Jorns do not survey whether creative activities are defined as on or off-campus, it is clear that off-campus work has become highly regarded in most reviews of professional development.

Still, many questions remain unanswered. Is it appropriate for a theatre department to expect faculty to work off-campus? What do we mean when we talk about off-campus activities and how do we evaluate them? Given the heavy teaching and service load in most theatre departments, when can one undertake such work? Is it appropriate for a faculty member to leave campus during ths semester to work outside of the department? Is it appropriate to reward faculty members who have been paid for their off-campus activities?

I do not propose to answer all of these complicated questions. What I hope to do is address some of the issues that have been raised to extend what I hope will become a continuing dialogue. If we ignore the problems of "professionalism" and off-campus work (professional and off-campus are often used synonymously), many of us will be hurt when tenure, merit, and/or promotion decisions are made. And those of us who undertake off-campus responsibilities will be uncertain that our efforts will be appreciated and encouraged.

1. Is it appropriate for the department to expect faculty to work off-campus?

Theatre departments will expect faculty members to work off-campus for a number of reasons. The American Theatre Association has clearly stated that tenure and/or promotion decisions should not be predicated on educational theatre work but on work done outside the confines of the university. This expectation, while viewed by some as being unfair, is rooted in a desire to make the academic world appreciative of creative accomplishments. Historians, critics, and theatre scholars traditionally have been awarded tenure and promotion for their professional undertakings: publication, convention papers, grants. The equivalent for performing artists is defined as off-campus production work. On-campus production is defined as part of the teaching load.

Job market realities also require off-campus activity. As competition for teaching positions grows, particularly in the current shrinking market, those persons who can prove professional competencies will be in greater demand as instructors.

Students choosing professional degree programs (BFA, MFA) are attracted to institutions whose faculty work outside of the university and can provide them with insights regarding the "working world." Professors who have not worked in the profession are at a disadvantage in guiding their students into non-academic work. They also are at a disadvantage in recruiting the strongest students.

Still, each department must be clear about why it expects its faculty to work outside of the university. The answer to this question will determine the kinds of activities that the department will support and reward. Is the requirement meant to rejuvenate faculty, provide professional visibility, strengthen recruitment efforts, make the instructor aware of the working world, or to assist students when they graduate? A small liberal arts-oriented department that uses the expectation to rejuvenate faculty and to make them more aware of the "working theatre world" should not necessarily expect instructors to be successful commerical artists but, instead, should expect them to undertake activities which include contact with and observations of the outside theatre world. Those programs that compete for the most advanced professionally-oriented students and thrive on high visibility, need some faculty who are accomplished working artists.

2. What do we mean when we talk about off-campus activities and how do we evaluate them?

The major problem in expecting faculty to work off-campus is our failure to define such theatre work and our failure to provide a means of evaluating it. In most instances, off-campus has been erroneously equated with the professional, commerical theatre.

Rather than "professional" or even "off-

campus," I prefer the term non-academic, theatrical work. This means that the following types of activities should be considered in evaluating faculty productivity: community theatre, summer stock, summer festivals, fringe theatre (e.g. New York's off-off-Broadway, Chicago's off-Loop), regional theatres, and commerical theatre. All of these are valid experiences. A creative project at another university would not fall within this category and those departments which require non-academic accomplishments should rate such off-campus work as less significant when evaluating faculty.

The kind of work undertaken, also needs to be defined. The unwritten assumption is that one must be an active creator in the theatrical process. There is, of course, the possibility of attaching oneself to a professional company in the capacity of observer or assistant in order to enhance our understanding of the profession. Such a project could be undertaken for example, on sabbatical, particularly by faculty whose exclusive contact with the profession has been academic. As noted, departmental needs must be taken into account.

Unfortunately, while we have begun to require non-academic experiences, we are afraid and hesitant to evaluate such work carefully and thoroughly. The findings by Gibson and Jorns are startling and frightening. According to their statistics, *in only 39% of the reporting schools is a written report of the evaluation [of a creative project] required. Although strong arguments have and are being made for the importance of creative work as an alternative to publication is refereed journals, it is surprising that not even the majority of schools permitting the practice require documentation of the evaluation.*[3] The critical need for such documented evaluations, particularly for off-campus work, is obvious. We all know that the activities of certain summer stock theatres could be more significant than the work at some community theatres. Fringe theatre productions could be more significant than commerical work. If, as academics, we are not embarrassed to judge scholarly accomplishments, we should not be fearful of passing judgment on non-academic, theatrical activities. The problem is devising a means to do so.

I propose the following as a series of steps to be taken by a faculty members when undertaking non-academic, theatrical activities so that his/her work can be evaluated fairly by a department's personnel committee when making decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and salary increments. (a) Prior to undertaking a non-academic activity, the faculty member should provide the committee with information regarding the theatrical institution involved and the assignment. If the activity requires the faculty member to be off-campus during a semester, the committee must consider this factor in advising the chair. (b) If at all possible, members of the committee and faculty should be invited to attend the presentation in which the faculty member is involved. (c) Support materials should be provided to the committee. These materials could include reviews, photographs, and letters from directors, actors, and producers. (d) The faculty member, in consultation with the personnel committee, should choose an outside evaluator to review work that the committee cannot see. The evaluator could be a theatre academician or an established theatre professional (e.g. critic, director, actor, designer). (e) The faculty member should submit an evaluation of the project which contains an explanation of why the experience was beneficial for his or her growth as a theatre educator. The project should be analyzed in relation to the instructor's teaching assignment.

Another difficult evalative problem remains. Many faculty members will have non-academic accomplishments undertaken prior to coming to their current position. We should expect these faculty in a similar fashion to substantiate and document these accomplishments as fully as possible. Furthermore, faculty with previous non-academic credentials should be expected to continue to work non-academically.

3. Given the heavy teaching and service load in most theatre department, when can one undertake off-campus work, and when it appropriate for the faculty member to leave campus during the semester to work outside the university?

There only are a few times when a faculty member can undertake non-academic activities: during the semester, during the summer, or during a sabbatical or educational leave. It is obvious that leaving campus during the semester can be disruptive. Nonetheless, because most non-academic theatre seasons coincide with the academic year, theatre departments must establish a policy for dealing with short leaves. The following is recommended: (a) All faculty members should be made aware that their department will allow short leaves for significant non-academic work. Tenure status and/or rank are not determining factors; departmental need, the ability to cover the classes and the project are. (Parenthetically, it is necessary that all faculty members be encouraged to undertake off-campus work. The requirement should not be viewed as a sword hanging over the heads of those non-tenured instructors who are in less secure positions. To do so creates divisiveness.) (b) The faculty member must discuss plans with the department's personnel committee in advance. The committee will advise the chair regarding the feasibility or an absence from campus. (c) The faculty member must prove that the activity will not drastically diminish classroom activities and the learning process. Plans for providing substitutes and other means of coverning classes must be provided. (d) Only one leave in the department, with a usual maximum of three weeks, should be allowed per semester. Of course, the personnel committee should use its discretion.

When a faculty member is off-campus for less than three weeks, the department should try to find ways to help meet class assignments. If all faculty members are assured that they will be assisted when undertaking non-academic theatre work, they should not feel that they are being taken advantage of when asked to cover classes for short periods of time. If an instructor will be gone for more than three weeks, the expense incurred in hiring a replacement should be borne by the

absent faculty member. (e) The personnel committee should carefully analyze student evaluations for those courses an instructor has missed. If any problems are indicated, the committee must take these into account the next time the faculty member request a leave. (f) The department should attempt to construct imaginative course schedules that might allow for a faculty member to leave campus without missing classes. The earlier a faculty member makes the personnel committee aware of a non-academic project, the easier adjustments to the program become. The real obstacle for theatre faculty is that they are often located in areas that are great distances from theatre centers. For this reason, we need to program imaginatively. Perhaps we can allow one faculty member per semester to have a two day teaching schedule. Possibly a faculty member could be scheduled for only early morning classes thereby freeing him or her in the afternoons and evenings. While I realize these solutions are simplistic, we must begin to experiment. Our locations often demand that we be flexible if we are serious about encouraging faculty to undertake non-academic projects.

Programs situated in the theatre centers can make the most demands on their creative faculty; they can require highly visible non-academic accomplishments and set the highest of standards. Departments outside the theatre centers, realizing how difficult non-academic undertakings are because of location, must be more realistic about their demands. If such programs feel that they need working professionals on their staff, they might consider hiring them as temporary "guest artists." (For that matter, many departments outside of theatre centers would be better served by assigning a temporary faculty line to rotating guest artists; students' awareness of the state of the art would be kept more current and teaching faculty could be more selective in choosing their off-campus assignments.) (g) The personnel committee must reaffirm its department's commitment to teaching. During the academic year, teaching must be a faculty member's primary concern. Just as a scholar would be penalized for allowing research to diminish teaching effectiveness, so too we must condemn theatre work that results in an instructor being ineffective in the classroom. Yet the opportunity for creative activity, just as for research, must exist. Sensible balance is necessary.

Since leaves of absence during a semester create difficulties, departments should encourage faculty to make applications for sabbatical and educational leaves during which the projects undertaken include contact with the non-academic theatre world. Programs must provide as much vigorous support for these kinds of projects as for traditional research undertakings. Furthermore, sabbaticals during which faculty work as non-paid assistants should not necessarily be evaluated as insignificant; the goal is not necessarily commercial success but an awareness of the field that can be brought back to the classroom. (An instructor who works as an unpaid design assistant, who auditions for theatre, film, and/or television work, or who functions as an artistic intern gains valuable insights.) Again, the personnel committee must give the faculty member feedback on the appropriateness of the chosen activity in light of teaching assignments as well as departmental needs and mission. In most instances, those faculty members who undertake sabbatical or educational leave projects will be tenured; the concern is not so much for activities that will affect their future status within the department but for those that will help rejuvenate, stimulate, and invigorate the instructor's teaching.

4. Is it appropriate to reward faculty members who have been paid for their non-academic activities?

Faculty members frequently will be paid for commerical theatrical ventures and then awarded merit increases and promotion for the same activities. Parallels can be drawn to faculty who publish commercially successful textbooks. While the personnel committee cannot exclude commerical activities from the evaluative process, these activities should be thoroughly evaluated. Commercial success should not automatically be equated with professional significance nor should it automatically be equated with professional insignificance. Such biased generalities are simplistic and counterproductive. Instead, we must evaluate each piece of work individually and consistently.

I hope, however, that personnel committees will attempt to reward those faculty members who have undertaken financial losses in order to work non-academically. By doing so, these faculty members aid the reputation and credibility of their department at their own expense. For example, a department could reward those who have taken a financial loss to work non-academically one summer with employment during a following summer.

In conclusion, the controversy over the requirement of off-campus activities will continue. We can minimize the anguish and hostility by making certain that the expectations of all faculty members are similar and realistic. Each department needs to analyze the expectations of its faculty in light of locale, needs, goals, and mission. There needs to be communication between the program's personnel committee and individual faculty members regarding how expectations might be met. We must reaffirm that a commitment to excellence in teaching is our primary objective; we must be clear that the requirement for non-academic activities is meant to improve instruction. We are not hoping to transform our faculty into professional, commercial artists but into better professional educators. We must, therefore, begin to evaluate non-academic activities individually, consistently, and within the context of our programs.

Endnotes

[1]Robert E. Davis, "Evaluating Faculty Creative Production," ACA *Bulletin*, #37 (August 1981), 17-21.
[2]*Theatre News*, 23, #7 (Fall 1981), 24.
[3]*Ibid.*

A CASE STUDY: EXTRAMURAL EVALUATION OF THEATRICAL PRODUCTION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Albert J. Harris

Extramural evaluation of all faculty theatrical production has been required at the University of Louisville since 1975. Since that time, the system has involved some twenty individual evaluators writing over one hundred separate evaluations of thirty productions. In retrospect, however, our department has found itself wondering whether the benefits of our system may have been obtained at too great a price. For instance, the one member of our faculty most familiar with college policy, a person whose standards are perhaps the highest in our department, now considers extramural evaluation "the single most damaging factor affecting our production program." This case study of our system may suggest to others whether this problem, and others, are inherent in extramural evaluation itself or whether they derive from concepts and procedures specific to the system we employ.

Advocates of extramural evaluation generally identify two potential benefits of such a process: improvement in quality of both individual and program production work, enhanced reliability in personnel actions based upon more and "better" evidence. At the University of Louisville, extramural evaluation was adopted almost entirely for the latter reason, and our procedures for obtaining evaluations are designed exclusively in evidentiary terms. One result has been that our department has won approval of every personnel recommendation concerning a production faculty member, with only one exception; and that exception led to a compromise, not a rejection. On the other hand, the problems we perceive are the result of those some procedures, which suggests the possibility that it may not be possible to obtain both of the potential benefits of extramural evaluation within the limits of a single system.

At the University of Louisville, the Department of Theatre Arts and Speech is housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. In 1974, our new dean undertook the development of our college's first formal, written "Personnel Policy and Procedures" document. Previously, personnel actions had been handled in a markedly informal manner; now, highly detailed criteria and practices (generally derived from those in use in the University of California system) were proposed, extensively debated, and eventually adopted.

Our department's principal objective during these deliberations was to ensure that theatrical activity received full recognition in the personnel policy. In fact, the first draft of the policy had identified three categories of faculty activity: "Teaching, *Research*, and Service" [italics mine]. We argued that this language was prejudicial and that other terminology should be used. We were gratified to discover widespread agreement with our position, and we watched with pleasure as all subsequent motions to amend this type of language were made by faculty from other departments. The result was that the second category of faculty activity was defined in the Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy as "Professional Activity. This may be considered under three headings: (a) Research; (b) Scholarship; (c) Other Creative Expression." Activity in this cateogry was further described in the Policy as "work presented in . . . suitable contexts for the evaluation of peers." This phrase had the practical effect of limiting professional activity to projects susceptible to extramural evaluation. Having argued that theatrical production was the full equivalent of traditional scholarship, we had no alternative but to agree to follow the college's regular policies and procedures governing such reviews.

Inevitably, the Extramural Evaluation Policy adopted by the College of Arts and Sciences was designed primarily to accommodate the evaluation of traditional publication. The college was forced to acknowledge this fact, after a frustrating attempt to define all-encompassing procedures, by adopting this statement: *The Theatre Arts and Speech Department and the Fine Arts Department will submit . . . a plan for obtaining extramural reviews of productions, exhibitions, or other creative activities which cannot be sent to reviewers.* The burden had been placed on our shoulders, and we had no choice but to propose a plan which corresponded in all essential elements to the college's general policy. (In the event, as we had expected, we were required to give written justification of even the most minor variance in detail.) The parameters within which we had to work included the following:

(1) All theatrical production work to be considered in any promotion or tenure review had to be extramurally evaluated;

(2) The department needed to compile a list of "neutral sources" who would be asked by the dean's office to nominate qualified evaluators; and

(3) The dean's office would make all contact with each evaluator in order to avoid any possibility or appearance of prejudice; the dean's office would also ensure anonymity in order to encourage forthrightness.

In applying these principles to theatrical production, as opposed to publication, two significant differences emerged. First, the publishing scholar would be able to collect all examples of scholarly work over a period of time, and the entire body of work could then be extramurally evaluated at the time of a major personnel action. This option, obviously, would not be available to an actor, a director, or a lighting designer, and would be available only in a limited and unsatisfactory sense to a scenic or costume designer. Thus, each production assignment would have to be evaluated as it occurred; because it was then available, this evidence inevitably found its way into merit reviews, even though this was not required by college policy. Second, while written scholarship could be mailed throughout the country for evaluation, our evaluators would be required actually to attend a performance of the production to be reviewed. The funding available in the dean's office to support this aspect of the program has never been more than a small fraction of the amount needed to operate the program well. Consequently, we could draw our evaluators only from a narrow geographical area, and each evaluator would be expected to assess the work of all faculty (designers, directors, actors) contributing to each production. This, in turn, caused another variance from normal college practice: ordinarily, the identity of the evaluators was kept only from the reviewee, and departmental personnel committees were able to assess the evaluations in terms of their authorship. In our case, however, because each evaluator would eventually assess practically every member of our faculty, confidentiality required that no one in our department should know the identity of the evaluator.

Having agreed upon the necessity of these exceptions, our department proceeded to draft extramural evaluation procedures, submitting them to the college personnel committee for approval. In our rationale, we wrote that *we reject the idea that photographs, videotapes, reviews, and the like could be an adequate representation of work specifically designed for another medium, and we note the present inability to provide adequate evidence in all these categories. Second, in agreement with the College's requirement that 'the candidate's oeuvres' as a whole must be evaluated, we reject the idea that the specific production work done during the year preceeding personnel action constitute the entire Extramural Evaluation.* This suggestion had been made as a means both of simplifying the process and of concentrating the limited funds available on the most significant personnel cases. In rejecting the suggestion as "neither educationally nor professionally sound," we also wished to avoid putting undue pressure on a faculty member at the time of, for example, a tenure review.

In retrospect, the procedures we submitted appear cumbersome, idealistic, and somewhat naive; in the interim, aspects of the original procedures have been changed for each of those reasons. However, the original procedures for extramural evaluation read:

Each year an Extramural Evaluation Committee will be formed, composed of qualified University faculty from outside the Department and of theatrically knowledgeable persons from the community and from educational and professional theatre. Members of the Committee will have the responsibility of attending all productions in which faculty work is presented and of submitting to the Department written evaluations of that work.

Selection of the Committee. Each Fall a "neutral source" will be asked to submit a list of qualified nominees for the Committee; the Department Personnel Committee will supplement this list with additional nominees. Each faculty member to be evaluated by the Committee shall have the opportunity to make summary objection to any nominee. The Department shall forward to the Dean's Office the final slate of nominees; from that slate the Dean's Office shall appoint a Committee of not less than four persons including both community and University representatives.

During the seven years since these procedures were written, every element has been changed but one: the concept of an extramural evaluation committee which would assess more than a single faculty member or a single production. Because the system was designed to provide evidence for personnel actions, and because the results of the system have not proved valuable to faculty development, our department has continued to support the principle that evaluators should see several productions in a given year, both for comparison among faculty members and in order to allow assessments to be made in the context of our entire production program. Even this principle, though, has been made flexible, as can be seen in this analysis of each change in procedure, presented in the order in which the items appeared in the original document.

(1) ". . .composed of qualified University faculty from outside the Department. . ." At the time this was written, the departmental faculty was extremely concerned that purely commercial standards should not be used in the evaluations. Some seemed to feel that "professionals" would apply standards that would be too high for a "mere" university theatre. There was concern among others that faculty might tend to ignore student needs in order to obtain "better" assessments. (The record clearly indicates that this particular problem never materialized.) To alleviate these concerns, the faculty chose to include non-departmental university faculty on the committee. When this decision was challenged, as expected, by the college personnel committee, the department replied that *production work in Theatre Arts also involves a teaching component, since those productions represent laboratory work for our students. We believe that University faculty can help in evaluating production work from that point of view, and that they would be likely to be knowledgeable concerning Departmental norms and individual contributions. Thus, we propose their inclusion as a supplementary source of information in the process.* The college committee acceded to our request, as it did to our request three years later that university faculty be excluded from the

Committee. By then it had become obvious to all that those faculty members had performed none of the functions for which they had been included. Furthermore, their assessments tended to be either highly doctrinaire or extremely permissive. The result of their inclusion, then, were both non-productive and counterproductive, and so membership on the committee was restricted to persons from the educational and professional theatres in our region.

(2) "Members of the Committee will have the responsibility of attending all productions . . ." This principle continues to represent the ideal case, and preference in selection is given to nominees who indicate an ability to attend an entire season of productions. But strict adherence to this principle led to several unforseen consequences; for example, we could not appoint an alternate should a committee member miss a performance, because the alternate would not have attended "all productions." (Because the purpose of the system was fundamentally evidentiary, and a major principle in its application was avoidance of litigation, we were required to adhere to the letter, not the spirit, of the policy.) Furthermore, we found that many of the preferred nominees were unable or unwilling to commit themselves early in the fall to attend performances late in the spring. In the face of these problems, the advantages of continuity gave way to the practical need to have each production seen by the required number of qualified evaluators. Now, selected nominees are asked to indicate which productions they will be able to attend. From this information the dean's office appoints a committee with as much continuity as possible, and is able to select a replacement for any evaluator who proves unable to attend as scheduled.

(3) "Each Fall a 'neutral source' will be asked to submit a list of qualified nominees. . ." This procedure has changed in two ways. First, we found that the minimum mechanisms for selection are so cumbersome that they require the process to begin during the summer. As a result, it is difficult to accommodate the right of each faculty member to challenge nominees, although to date we have managed to contact each faculty member each year well before the start of classes. These mechanisms could be simplified if a substantial portion could be handled by telephone rather than in writing; because of the evidentiary nature of the process, however, our dean's office insists that all transactions be written. (The increasing tendency toward litigation on campuses nationwide seems inevitably to lead to this kind of scrupulous administrative procedure, however flexible a system may be at first.) Second, the college has abondoned the use of "neutral sources" throughout its extramural evaluation system. The use of these "neutral sources" had been intended to preclude any possibility of prejudice among evaluators. In practice, the college found that many of the most qualified potential evaluators were eliminated from consideration because they had served as neutral sources, and that untoward delays resulted from the introduction of this extra step in the selection process. Once "neutral sources" were eliminated, though, additional stress was placed on those procedures designed to insulate the evaluators from influence by departments or individual faculty members.

(4) "Each faculty member . . . shall have the opportunity to make summary objection to any nominee." Abuses of this type of procedure in other departments led to the alteration of this very liberal statement. Because some faculty members routinely vetoed practically every nominee, the number of peremptory challenges had to be limited. Now, in our department, each faculty member is entitled to two peremptory challenges from the original list of nominees; however, any faculty member may challenge an unlimited number of nominees "for course." By policy, a faculty member is expected to challenge "for cause" any nominee who may be prejudiced either against or in favor of the faculty member's work. "Challenge for cause" requires a written objection, ruled upon the department chair, whose ruling may be appealed to the department's personnel committee and then to the college's personnel committee. We have found that this new procedure greatly reduced the total number of challenges, and to date no ruling by the department chair has been appealed. On the other hand, because our slate of nominees must be acceptable to every faculty member (each of whom could be evaluated by any nominee), even this limited number of challenges makes it somewhat difficult to ensure an adequate number of nominees.

(5) ". . .the Dean's Office shall appoint a Committee of not less than four persons. . ." In our original decision to require four separate evaluations of each production project, we had intended to minimize the effect of a single prejudiced or wrongheaded assessment. (Experience showed that we did not need that number to accomplish that purpose, as can be seen below.) Once faculty from the university became ineligible to serve, though, the Dean's office found it impossible to form such a large committee, and also found that it lacked the funds to support a program of such a scale. Consequently, the number of evaluators assigned to each production was reduced to two; on occasion, upon the department's request, the dean's office has assigned a third evaluator to selected productions. It is worth noting in this context that traditional scholarship and publication is normally assessed by a larger number of evaluators, and thus receives a greater diversity of opinion. In this respect, the evaluation of any on-campus work seems inevitably to be limited by practical and economic factors that do not apply to the work of research scholars.

Having evolved in the ways indicated, our system of extramural evaluation has functioned fairly well in a technical sense: written reports are on file in the department office on every faculty production since 1975. There remain, however, questions concerning both the quality and the utility of the evaluations themselves, along with two significant problems in adhering to the spirit of the policy.

The first continuing policy problem is that of maintaining the required level of confidentiality. As was noted above, our department is expected to maintain the confidentiality of its production evaluations more broadly than is expected of any department for the evaluations of research or publication. In fact, it has proved impossible for us to remain

unaware of the identity of our evaluators, and in almost every case the individual authorship of the resulting reports is quite obvious. The simple fact that performance tickets must be reserved provides more than sufficient information to discern which nominees have been selected for any production; in addition, it is not unusual for the dean's office to make those reservations, which turns speculation into virtual certainty. (The natural inclination to provide choice seats for the evaluators only serves to provide stronger motivation to "figure out" their identity.) Once this information is known, internal evidence in the evaluations themselves--writing style, topics chosen for discussion, etc.--generally indicates authorship quite clearly. Furthermore, identification has been certain in several cases in which colleagues have chosen to send copies of their reports directly to the department or to the faculty member being evaluated. In practice, then, there is virtually no confidentiality in the very program in which confidentiality is considered most essential. If there is a solution to this problem, which is of concern principally to our dean's office, we have as yet been unable to find it.

The second policy problem relates to an aspect of general college policy not yet mentioned. Even though the authorship of individual evaluations is to be kept confidential, in the interest of due process each faculty member has the absolute right to see the content of any item of evidence placed in a personnel case, as required by the right of rebuttal explicitly contained in college policy. In this instance, though, the ephemeral nature of theatrical production creates a difficulty: the primary evidence (the production itself) will have ceased to exist by the time the evaluation is received, and one cannot correct a factual error or error of observation by referring to the production as an author would to a table of data or a publication. To cite an absurd but actual example: in Jean Anouilh's *Ring Round the Moon* a principal character spends the play in a wheelchair. Of this character, one evaluator wrote: *I kept wishing that her obviously well exercized legs had been covered with a lap robe or something. What the audience can't see, we can easily imagine is just as it is described to be; but when sight and hearing are contradicting each other, we always believe our eyes.* The comment seems to be an indictment of the carelessness of the director, or the costumer, or both, except for one fact: this actress had worn a lap robe throughout the performance. What, then, is one to make of this comment? Does such an error invalidate other observations in the report? And how, if one wishes, does one demonstrate inaccuracy in such cases? Often, one can only enlist collective memory and rely upon good will--a less decisive defense than is assumed in the policy to be possible.

Of much greater concern, though, is the effectiveness of the evaluations themselves. If such evaluations are to be useful, either in improving the quality of a production program or as evidence in a personnel case, it would seem essential that they articulate a qualitative distinction among various productions. Taken as a whole, the evaluations produced by our system have not met this criterion. This has been caused in part by a consistent tendency among evaluators to overstress the role of the director, assigning blame or credit to the director for the results of the efforts of others, and allocating a relatively small proportion of the reports to an analysis of the contributions of faculty actors, designers, and technicians. As a result, one learns relatively little from the evaluations about the quality of work in these categories, and that little tends to be couched in generalizations unsupported by the kind of detail that would make the comments useful.

In tending to overvalue the contribution of the director, as often as not the evaluators proceed to reach extreme judgments regarding the quality of that contribution. The work is generally seen to be either superior or inadequate; or, more accurately, as both superior (in the view of one evaluator) and inadequate (in the view of the other). The reports, then, not only fail to indicate careful discrimination, but also are contradictory.

Every theatre occasionally stages a production it considers a complete failure under its own prevailing standards, and our program is no exception. Since extramural evaluation was begun at our university, we have mounted two or three productions that we would like to erase from memory. It is both puzzling and somewhat disheartening, then, to note that each of these productions was considered absolutely excellent by at least one evaluator. Similarly, each of the productions of which we felt exceptionally proud was soundly condemned by at least one evaluator. As a result, for twenty-nine of the thirty productions evaluated under our system, one could demonstrate either superior directing or incompetent directing by selectively quoting the extramural evaluations. (The one exception was a production of my own which received two positive evaluations--a production which I personally consider to have been one of my least successful.) This point can be illustrated most graphically by quoting the two evaluations of a production of *The Duchess of Malfi*; the comments in the second passage have been re-ordered to parallel the first.

In this virtually conceptless production, Albert Harris did nothing in his direction to bring the play from it's [sic] period and into the minds and hearts of a contemporary audience. . . .One often felt the people onstage had little more idea what was being said and done than did the audience. . . . The physical production gave no support to the play or the production. The setting. . . was a boring arrangement of platforms that achieved the impossible; it was at once ugly and impossible to move on. . . . The lighting did nothing to create any atmosphere.

. . . . . .

Professor Harris did a first-rate job with an extremely difficult show. He caught the grim horror of the Jacobean period and made it play to a 20th century audience. . . . It is also a tribute to Harris that he was able to inspire his less experienced actors to approach the skill and maturity of [the actor playing Bosola] . . . the rest of the cast spoke

Webster's lines with understanding and conviction, and the plot and characters never lost the audience. . . .The set for Duchess was very effective. [The same designer] designed both the set and lights and they were appropriate to the space. Similarly, the music and sound fit Professor Harris' concept.

These passages also serve to illustrate the relatively cavalier treatment accorded to the work of designers in the evaluations: while the remarks dealing with directing were greatly condensed, comments of the work of the scenic and lighting designer are cited in their entirety. Nor is this the result of selecting evaluators uninterested in the technical areas: the first passage was written by a professional designer.

The fact that each of our evaluators is asked to assess all faculty work displayed in a production, regardless of category, has proved to be both a continuing source of dissatisfaction and a potential source of litigation. Clearly, it would be preferable to enlist two directors to assess the work of the director, two designers to assess the designers, etc. Equally clearly, the system lacks funds to support so extensive a practice. As a result, extramural evaluation of theatrical productions in our college fails to adhere to the normal college policy that faculty will be evaluated by "recognized experts" who are "deemed suitable . . . in *each area of specialty* [italics mine]. Considering this discrepancy in the system, it is difficult to see how the department or the college could defend a negative personnel decision against a legal appeal.

These problems culminate in the difficulty of assessing the work of a faculty technical director. Fewer than one-fifth of our evaluation reports even mention technical direction, and few of those that do yield assessments of any significance. Almost without exception, the comments parallel (though more briefly) the frustrated remark of one evaluator that *it is always difficult to evaluate the work of the technical director. Supposedly, he follows the plans of the designer, and only obvious and unintentional flaws in construction can properly be laid to his responsibility.*

Our original departmental personnel policy, which was accepted by our college, was quite specific in considering the work of the technical director to be professional activity rather than service. We now face pressure to place this type of activity entirely within the service category because it may not be fully susceptible to extramural evaluation. Whatever the merits of that change in categorization (and we recognize that there are valid arguments in favor of such a change), our department has taken the position that to do so for that reason would be to mistake cause for effect. To date, though, no acceptable procedure has been found within our system to deal with our concerns and those of our college.

The most serious continuing problem, however, is the apparent effect on faculty morale of our current system of extramural evaluation. Unlike research scholars, whose work need be submitted for evaluation only every five or six years, our production faculty perceive their work and the work of their colleagues to be subject to constant scrutiny. As evaluation reports arrive in the department at brief, regular intervals, it becomes tempting to work toward improved evaluations rather than toward improved quality for its own sake. As was noted above, this tendency is reinforced by the fact that the evaluations are included in merit recommendations, as is not generally true with traditional scholarship. This sense of constant scrutiny, coupled with the (apparently accurate) perception that evaluators tend to favor the cautious artistic choice, appears to be the principal cause in the growth of a far more conservative aesthetic in our production program than most of us would prefer.

Should a solution be found to this psychological burden, the other concerns articulated above would undoubtedly be perceived as less significant and more susceptible to resolution. It is somewhat ironic that our department is consistent in urging changes intended to produce more thorough and more rigorous, but more effective, evaluations, while the solutions we propose run counter to the evidentiary principles embedded in our college's procedures. Those strictures apparently will prevent the adoption of the several obvious remedies which readily appear; the strictures of inadequate funding preclude the adoption of other equally apparent reforms. The temptation, then, is to conclude that a system of extramural evaluation established to improve the production program by improving the accuracy of personnel decisions may be fated, inevitably and ironically, to produce precisely the opposite effect.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION AT WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS

Sidney J. Friedman

Since interest in external review of faculty in performance areas is growing, it may be helpful to describe the external review program which was initiated in 1978 at Washington University in St. Louis. Perhaps the successes and problems of that effort will be instructive to others seeking suitable means for evaluating theatre faculty within their departments.

The Context. In 1978, theatre at Washington University was taught primarily in the Performing Arts Area (PAA) which offered the BA degree only in dance and drama. The PAA typically graduated between five and ten majors per class, yet attracted well over 1000, sometimes as high as 1500, students annually through a number of popular introductory courses. The PAA faculty was partially comprised--especially in drama--of people who held joint appointments with such other programs as English, music, and black studies. The full-time faculty, five in dance, six in drama, was augmented by about five part-time appointments each in dance and drama.

One consequence of this organization was that, in spite of the size of the program, the participants in promotion and tenure decisions had, as of 1978, never included more than four tenured PAA faculty, of whom only one held a full-time appointment in the area. Since the administration insisted on larger committees to review cases of promotion and tenure, professors of English, music, classics, asian studies, biology, and chemistry, were appointed at various times to participate in recommendations concerning the future of theatre faculty. These appointments created resentment among some members of the faculty and required the remainder to undertake education and conciliation.

More crucially, these committees had trouble persuading the administration of the validity of their recommendations. For example, in 1976-77, a very strong recommendation against tenure and promotion was returend by the dean to the Tenure Review Committee for reconsideration. In 1977-78, a very strong recommendation for tenure and promotion was denied, resulting in immense anger and plummeting morale among PAA faculty. The crux of the issue was that, in the absence external and timely evaluation of production work, the Tenure Review Committee could not make a persuasive case--either pro or con--concerning the creative achievements of the faculty under review.

In the wake of these decisions I sought and obtained from the dean funding for an external review program. (What alternative had he, given his refusal of promotion based on the lack of external and presumably less biased evaluation?) The following year two directors, both associate professors, sought promotion. Both received the strong endorsement of the Tenure Review Committee. One had his production reviewed and was promoted; the other did not and was not. The message was clear to all: external review of the production work of theatre faculty eligible for promotion would henceforth be mandatory.

The Program. In the summer of 1979 I wrote a statement of "Policies and Procedures regarding Annual Reviews, Promotions and Tenure in the Performing Arts Area," a fourteen-page document that attempted to spell out all the agreed-upon promotion and retention practices within the PAA. Copies of this document were given to all old and new PAA faculty in order to reduce the chances of misunderstanding concerning how tenure decisions would be reached. The quotations that follow are from Section II, B. of that document, a section entitled, "Research and Creative Activity."

1. *Research in the Performing Arts Area may lead to theatrical production (choreography, playwriting, direction, design, performance, etc.) rather than publciation. The Area accepts such theatrical endeavor in lieu of traditional scholarship in evaluations for appointment, promotion or tenure.*

2. *In evaluating creative ability the Performing Arts Area adheres to the "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Theatre Arts Faculty" adopted by the American Theatre Association in August, 1978. Those guidelines state:*

a) *When the teacher/scholar is expect to produce scholarly work over and above his/her regular teaching load, so should the teacher/artist be expected, likewise, to produce artistic work beyond his/her regularly assigned responsibilities.*

b) *This presupposes that the teacher/artist's involvement in theatre production receives appropriate credit in his/her normal teaching load.*

c) *Where the teacher/artist is required to be involved in production in addition to a full teaching load, his performance in production should be accepted as the quivalent of similar scholarly achievements.*

d) *Just as traditional scholarly achievement is juried and evaluated, so must artistic achievement be evaluated objectively. The guidelines for such evaluation are: peer evaluation based on clear comparion of the teacher/artist's work with that of his colleagues doing similar work; outside peer*

evaulation by experts in the field; and exposure of the teacher/artist's work outside his normal surroundings and preferably within a professional arena. Evidence of the quality of such work should be documented by critical review or other similar evaluative tools.

The next paragraph deals with expectations concerning performance work "within a professional arena." I continue with

4. Most of the creative activity of members of the Performing Arts Area faculty has been in the realm of theatrical production -- as directors, choreographers, designers, performers, etc. Since this sort of creativity is time-bound, that is, it cannot be put into the mail and sent off to a colleague for review, it has become the practice of the Area to import referees to view the production work of full-time Instructors, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors. Choice of these outside reviewers rests with the Chairman of the Area, who will normally arrange for reviewers before or during early rehearsals.

We felt it essential to have more than one reviewer for each production effort. None of us wanted the record of our work to be an idiosyncratic set of responses. The chances of two respondents being similarly skewed seemed slim.

Subsequent experience led to lengthening the lead time for selection of reviewers: I tried to arrange for reviewers of the first and maybe second production the preceding spring and the remainder of the year's productions early in the fall.

Faculty members, including the person whose work is being reviewed, may suggest referees. In any event, it is expected that the referees will be persons of substantial achievement in the art form they are reviewing. They may be drawn either from college programs or from the world of professional dance or drama.

I usually did seek a referee who had been suggested by the person under review. My best leads on referees, however, came from other theatre department chairpersons. A word of caution: watch out for school and other personal ties that might prejudice the review.

The Chairman may elect to substitute evaluations by reviewers from the American College Theatre Festival for those of referees chosen by the Area. Since such reviewers are not selected by the Chairman, they may not be people the Chairman or the person under review regards as "experts in the field," and since the identity of such reviewers is rarely known in advance of production week, inclusion of such evaluations in the faculty member's dossier will occur only by agreement between the Chairman and the faculty member, such agreement to be reached before the referee's viewing of the production.

This provision has saved the PAA money. It also has aroused the ire of regional ACTF chairpersons who do not like the quality of the "festival" tarnished with the pressure of personnel decisions. My response has been threefold: (1) in our instance the inclusion of a festival adjudicator's response in a dossier is with the permission of the faculty member concerned; (2) the response is not crucial to a career in any event since it is one of many reviews accumulated between initial employment and a bid for promotion; and (3) it is not the only review of the play in question.

Since the Performing Arts Area views the rehearsal process as a teaching situation and believes the learning of the student in the preparation of the performance as important as the finish of the product which is presented to audiences, and since fair evaluation of faculty directors is facilitated by seeing the caliber of student performers early in rehearsal, evaluators of directors are asked to attend at least one early rehearsal as well as at least one performance. Then they will be asked to evaluate faculty directors in terms of both process and product.

On their first visit, reviewers also were shown the facilities available to the faculty member and were offered information concerning the limitations of budget, personnel, curriculum and training, time, and space within which the work was being done. Only directors were reviewed in rehearsal.

Decision as to whether a letter of evaluation is to be open to the faculty person being evaluated or is to remain confidential is left to the referee.

Not a single referee from 1978 through the spring of 1981 refused the faculty artist access to the evaluation. Most looked upon it as an extraordinary opportunity for collegial sharing and professional growth. (I did experience one instance, however, of a reviewer whose reaction to the production was so negative he refused to write the evaluation.)

A faculty member may submit to the Chairman in writing . . . the names of persons the faculty member believes biased toward his work and the nature of their bias. If the Chairman seeks evaluations from any of these people, he does so forewarned as to their possible bias.

Documentation and review of theatrical work done outside the Performing Arts Area production calendar is the responsibility of individual members of the faculty.

I did not receive a single name of a potentially biased reviewer. I did note instances in which outside work was poorly documented; in fact, its documentation and review was rarely as persuasive as that of reviewers brought to campus productions. Faculty might profitably give more attention to this matter.

Results. Operation of the external review program at Washington University in St. Louis from spring 1978 through spring 1981 suggests the following, still tentative, conclusions.

1) External review consumed much administrative and faculty time. Getting reviewers, given the busy schedules of theatre faculty, proved difficult. Even when arrangements were made a semester in advance, illness or other unforseen circumstances caused cancellations and hurried searches for a replacement. The cooperation of a few senior colleagues at nearby colleges who could visit on relatively short notice proved invaluable. The arrangments for air reservations and tickets, accommodations, meals, in-town transportation, conferences and rehearsal/performance scheduling, receipt of reviews, honoraria, and the reimbursals of expenses were time-consuming.

2) External review requires considerable financial support. We paid a modest honorarium

($175 for two overnight trips to St. Louis and the writing of the review). Airfare plus hotel, meals, and transportation averaged about $300 per trip, with production evaluation of faculty directors totaling about $1550. Deans who talk about seeking validation of artistic faculty through external review will have to put their money where their mouth is.

3) The quality of written reviews varied greatly. Had I remained in the chair I would have tried to frame a statement for potential reviewers, especially those not based in academia, clarifying our expectations concerning the scope and specificity of the evaluation. In general, our experience was that the more administrative experience the reviewer had, the better he or she understood what was needed in a letter of evaluation of a faculty member.

4) Instituting an external review program seemed to make some faculty more alert, less slipshod in their production work; others became very nervous about being watched in rehearsal. The program seemed to me to pose a danger of a stultifying caution in play selection and production approach, a tendency toward safe choices.

5) External review provided a mechanism for exchange with outstanding theatre artists and faculty, an exchange that fostered professional growth in those faculty artists who welcomed such interaction. It also reduced a pressure on PAA faculty who were no longer charged with the sole responsibility for evaluating one another's work.

6) External review increased the visibility of Washington University and its Performing Arts Area. Visitors from all over the country were introduced to us, our campus and our work.

7) This increased visibility contributed, I believe, to increased mobility of some faculty. Able people could document their success and generate demand for their services elsewhere. Those without such documentation, similarly, found confirmation or hiring elsewhere increasingly problematic.

8) The presence of a docment describing departmental policies and procedures concerning promotion and tenure was greatly appreciated, especially by junior faculty who often entered the university with very vague ideas about how their continuation there would be decided. And,

9) Finally, while experience with external review is not yet extensive, a much greater congruence has emerged between Tenure Review Committee recommendations and subsequent administration actions. Perhaps the accumulated letters make for sounder judgments at the committee level; perhaps those letters provide fuller buttressing of committee recommendations; perhaps both.

ALIEN THEATRE AND THE DEPARTMENTAL RESUME

Daniel W. Alkofer

There is a growing tendency in academic theatre to require of many in our profession continuing proof of competence in areas that seem to me to be alien. In fact, it is being argued, only when many of us have proved ourselves competent in these alien areas have we demonstrated competence in our own, as if our standards were dependent on theirs. The impropriety of this argument is plain to me, and I shall undertake in this paper to bring more to my side of the case, to the side of a clearer perception of our own professional mission.

Guidelines for merit increments, promotion, tenure, and dismissal are depending more and more on these alien accomplishments. Such guidelines are of manifest importance in the profession of academic theatre, and thus the significance of the issues I shall raise is clear.

The alien areas to which I refer are those within "professional theatre." Theatre departments offering pre-professional degree programs in acting, directing, and design, have been especially eager to demand of their faculties continuing active participation in professional theatre as a condition of rehiring, promotion, or tenure. Even in such departments, these demands are highly questionable, for, to put the argument in its briefest form, the work to be done is within academic, not professional, theatre. I shall not argue that professional theatre experience is irrelevant to qualify for academic appointment, but rather that it is not essential or even especially important in the demonstration of continuing competence as an artist.

The argument for demonstrating a continual competence in the professional theatre derives from a felt need to require verification of competence by extra-mural experts, by analogy, with the verification made possible by published research in other academic areas. Theatre artists, at at least those who need not publish research in order to survive, must, so the argument goes, also reach with their art to the larger audience. Like published scholarship, artistic achievement must be broadcast regionally, nationally, or internationally. Otherwise, theatre artists, protected from the rebuffs of editorial rejection on one hand and the glare of high level professional critical opinion on the other, will fail to grow as artists.

I cannot quarrel with the desire continually to verify our faculties' artistic abilities and thereby to insure artistic growth. And where keen, disinterested criticism is difficult to obtain within a department, extra-mural experts may need to be provided.

My quarrel is with the next, unnecessary step, namely to require faculty to take their skills out of the department and into the "professional" arena. This is not an adequate test of abilities, and, furthermore, suffers from being motivated by an overriding need for departmental visibility. Generally, the question raised is not really one of competence but rather something like "What have you done lately for the Departmental Resume?"

I believe that theatre academics have not sufficiently separated the issue of visibility from that of competence when they institute requirements for faculty employment in professional theatre. Incredibly, falsely, not conceiving how much the allure of visibility has colored their values, they assume that work done in professional theatre is *ipso facto* of higher quality than work done within their department's program and, therefore, indicates the greatest growth and the highest merit as academic theatre professionals.

The argument runs that the highest artistry can only be found in "professional theatre." One does not have to be as good an artist, perhaps cannot be as good, when one works in academic theatre. The level of criticism, the quality of production capability, and the peer pressure for achievement are not as high in academe. The audiences are less discriminating at home; they do not really know the difference between good and bad theatre. But when you are working in "professional theatre," the argument continues, all this is turned around.

That, of course, is patent nonsense. The argument now has reduced itself to absurdity. The professional theatre simply cannot be granted that kind of superiority.

In the first place, most professional theatre is not a first-class operation. Far too much of it is fly-by-night, conceptually sterile, artistically overwhelmed by commercial motives, and/or inclined in hiring practices toward nepotism. In unions or out of unions, one can get paid for shoddy work, over and over again. Occasionally Broadway and the most prestigious repertory companies produce ashen clinkers that are a credit to

no one. At least, everyone has to grant that the quality of professional theatre productions vary tremendously. Clearly, every professional credit needs to be evaluated separately, by the most incisive critics.

And, we cannot simply yield to the media reviewers the business of incisive criticism. Very few of them engage in it, no matter what the size of the metropolitan area, nor how close to an ocean. Our own profession has the critical resources to do the job, and we have the professional obligation to put those resources to work to regulate the quality of our artistic work.

When was the last time you attended a play with a discriminating audience? I contend that the chances are as good that you found that audience at home as that you found it at a professional production. We must be very careful about what we think a professional theatre experience actually provides.

It is easier to contrive an artistically excellent directorial or design concept for a university stage than for a professional stage? This is the sort of question to be settled empirically, not by simply assuming the superiority of professional theatre. The answer is that it is not easier. The demands for a highly artistic accomplishment in academic theatre are at least as high as for our alien cousin. Professional theatre tends to replace the artistic with the commercial to such an extent that superiority cannot be assumed.

"Professional theatre" represents at best an alternative forum for excellence, one based on a value system quite different in kind from that which properly belongs to academic theatre. Do we really wish to insist that our creative artists achieve excellence in that forum as well, in spite of its alien standards? If so, it must be because we would require our faculty to demonstrate the particular skills required for employment in that profession. I challenge those who advocate this requirement to list the qualities required for professional theatre that are not demonstrated adequately in academic theatre. I suggest that the list will be a very skimpy one, having nothing to do with what we really want our faculties to possess.

Nevertheless, it may be that it is a good idea for some programs inordinately concerned with "visibility" and also unsure of their own qualitative standards to continue to give paramount value in some areas of faculty evaluation to work in professional theatre. This is their problem, but it should not be everyone's.

I propose instead that department heads commit themselves to two courses of action. First they should insist to higher administrators, tenure review committees, and others of that sort, that excellence in theatre can be tested fully in an academic setting, without apology for any working conditions. Second, they should insure that only the best theatre is good enough for their own departmental programs. If we are beset by administrators who can think only in terms of standard forms of research or who are blinded by the spectacular glare of "professional theatre," we must not sit idly by while our own professional standards are degraded. A measure of professional and artistic chauvanism is in order.

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR THEATRE ARTS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL

Lynn Murray

Evaluation and accreditation continue to be issues of major concern for teachers in the secondary school. Although evaluative criteria for art and music exist under "Section 4: Educational Programs in the National Study of School Evaluation (NSSE)", no special criteria exist for evaluating drama and theatre arts. In fact, drama and theatre are currently included in "Section 5: Student Activities Programs." Theatre and drama, then, are treated by NSSE as activities (extra-curricular) rather than as academic subjects when school programs are being evaluated.

Several years ago the Texas Educational Theatre Association (TETA) developed "Evaluative Criteria for Theatre Arts," modeled after the evaluative instruments for art and music currently used by NSSE. These "Evaluative Criteria for Theatre Arts" have been adopted by the Accrediting Commission for Schools (the western states), Virginia's Department of Education, Kentucky's Committee on Secondary Schools, New England's Association of Schools and Colleges, the Northeast Association of Schools, the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, and the Texas Education Agency. Regrettably, the criteria have not yet been recognized by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Even more regrettably, NSSE will not adopt these evaluative criteria. The executive secretary of NSSE, responding to several years of correspondence on the matter, has promised only "to maintain a file on this rapidly growing area." NSSE explains that it will develop its own criteria if and when it decides that drama and theatre are "legitimate" academic programs.

If theatre educators are to maintain standards of quality, they must insist on the legitimacy of their educational goals. To that end, the Secondary School Theatre Association (a division of the American Theatre Association) is mounting an active campaign to have drama and theatre arts recognized as an academic subject in the evaluative criteria of the National Study of School Evaluation.

The task should not be SSTA's alone, however. Theatre administrators within colleges and universities have an obvious stake in the educational quality of high school theatre programs. Moreover, college and university theatre administrators often work closely with teacher-training programs in their own school and with state Departments of Education, which certify secondary teachers. College and university administrators, then, could do a great deal to assist SSTA in its efforts to disseminate these evaluative criteria and to lobby for their adoption. It seems appropriate, therefore, for SSTA to present theatre administrators with the evaluative criteria and to enlist their support in their adoption.

Following is a version of the criteria developed in accord with NSSE models. We urge all administrators to study them, to promote their adoption in their school, state, and region, and to urge their acceptance by the National Study of School Evaluation.

APPENDIX

The following EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR THEATRE ARTS was developed by the Texas Educational Theatre Association, modeled after the National Study of School Evaluation evaluative instruments for art and music.

In 1979, H.E. Phillips, then Executive Secretary of the Texas Secondary Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, authorized the use of this instrument by Texas schools conducting self-study. W.R. Goodson, present Executive Secretary for the Texas Secondary Committee, suggests that this policy be continued in the evaluation of all courses in theatre arts.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools has evaluative criteria for art and music which is included in Section 4: Education Programs. There is no specialized criteria for theatre arts/drama, however. This subject is only mentioned in Section 5: Student Activities Programs.

Consequently, theatre arts/drama has previously been treated as an activity in evlauation procedures, despite the fact that it has been a recognized academic subject in Texas public schools since 1960.

Use of this EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR THEATRE ARTS will provide a more accurate, equitable, and beneficial evaluation of educational theatre programs.

THEATRE ARTS

To be used as a supplement to Section 4 * of EVALUATIVE CRITERIA, Fifth Edition when conducting self-study

Name of School _____ **Date** _____

Self-evaluation by

(Name) _____ (Position) (Name) _____ (Position) (Name) _____ (Position)

(Name) _____ (Position) (Name) _____ (Position) (Name) _____ (Position)

(Name) _____ (Position) (Name) _____ (Position) (Name) _____ (Position)

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

These principles are offered for your acceptance, rejection, or modification. Please feel free to make changes.

There should be some evidence indicating that the influence of the theatre arts program is felt by the entire student body. The program is to be thought of as more than courses and activities confined to a theatre. Theatre arts can challenge the creative power of all students. It will seek to have all students know of the relationship of drama to every important aspect of daily living.

Theatre arts can help all students to develop a keener awareness of aesthetic values; to develop manipulative and organizational skills in expressing ideas, feelings, and moods; to explore personal interests and aptitudes; to acquire a knowledge of humanity's visual, literary, and creative theatrical heritage for the purpose of building an understanding of our culture in relation to other times and places; to become involved in and to respond to theatrical experiences; to make sound and critical judgements suited to their maturity level; to develop sensitive discrimination in the use of theatre arts activities as a part of the home, the school, and the community.

NOTE: Before proceeding with work on this section, prepare and attach as a part of the section a list of the major goals of the theatre arts program that will aid in the achievement of the objectives of the school (as stated in Section 3, "Philosophy and Objectives").

* May be used as a guide in completing section Q of the SECONDARY SCHOOL EVALUATIVE CRITERIA NARRATIVE EDITION

General

Staff members conducting self-evaluations are encouraged to modify the Guiding Principles, the checklist items, and the evaluation items, when necessary to make them congruent with the objectives and characteristics of the school or community. In those instances where significant changes are made, the reasons for the changes should be identified unless otherwise obvious.

The two fundamental guidelines for school evaluation are (1) the characteristics of the school and community and (2) the school's philosophy and objectives. Therefore, Section 2, "School and Community," and Section 3, "Philosophy and Objectives," should be kept in mind when the items of this section are being checked and evaluated. While making evaluations persons should ask: "How well do the practices in this school meet the needs of the school and community?" and "How well do the practices conform to the philosophy and objectives of this school?" When evaluations are made, factors such as size, type, location of school, financial support, and state requirements should not be used to justify failure to provide a program or facilities appropriate to the needs of the school and community consistent with the philosophy and objectives of the school. Also, the two-fold nature of the work — evaluation and stimulation to improvement — should be kept in mind. Careful, discriminating judgments are essential if these purposes are to be satisfactorily achieved.

Checklists and Evaluations

Both the checklist items and the evaluation items should be judged on the following scale:

5 Excellent
4 Good
3 Fair
2 Poor
1 Missing But Needed
NA Not Applicable

In the process of arriving at a single numerical rating for an item, the self-study committee and/or the visiting team members are asked to consider both the extent to which provisions exist and the adequacy with which they are functioning. In those instances where there is significant disparity between the provision for, and the function or utilization of an item observed, a description or recommendation should be included in the self-study and/or the visiting team report. (Example: If classrooms are exceptionally well equipped but the use of the equipment is limited, the evaluator(s) should assign a numerical rating and call attention to the fact that even though the facilities are excellent, their ineffective use results in a lower rating.)

Questions frequently arise about the basis for comparison of points on the scale. The answer is extremely difficult to give. In any entity as complex as a school, it is not easy to describe in detail what *excellent* or *poor* really means in the hundreds of items for which judgments are required. The best answer seems to be that the evaluator should draw upon his total professional experience and make a judgment on the basis of that experience. It should be kept in mind that 5 does not mean ideal or perfect. There is reason to believe that some schools are underrated in the self-evaluation because an impression is held that 5 should be reserved for an unattainably high condition.

Each person who makes an evaluation should try to be as accurate as possible. If a slight change in the wording of an item would make it more appropriate to the school being evaluated, such a change should be made. If important elements of the school's program are omitted, the subcommittee members are encouraged to add checklist and evaluation items to make the description more complete.

Let us consider an example that will assist in understanding the use of the scale. Examine the statement "classrooms are equipped with demonstration facilities." If, in your judgment, the classrooms are equipped with demonstration facilities that are some of the best that you have seen, circle the number 5. On the other hand, if you decide that the demonstration facilities are good but not the best, circle the number 4. Should the demonstration facilities be fair, circle the number 3. If the demonstration facilities are poor, circle the number 2. If, however, the facilities are non-existent but necessary, circle the number 1. Should the facilities be unnecessary, circle NA.

Comments

The space under the heading, Comments, at the end of each subsection should be used to provide additional information needed to provide a comprehensive report of that area and to describe any condition that is not adequately covered elsewhere in the subsection. The space can also be used to clarify or amplify items in the checklists or evaluations. Subcommittees are encouraged to use this space any time it will aid in describing the area or in explaining a judgment or rating.

Supplementary Data and Additional Areas

Some facets of programs may not be described by the checklist and evaluation statements. For this reason, additional information items are sometimes requested under Supplementary Data. If portions of a program — or additional content areas — cannot be adequately covered by amplifying Supplementary Data and Comments, it is suggested that the following outline be used:

I. Organization
II. Nature of Offerings
III. Physical Facilities
IV. Direction of Learning
V. Outcomes
VI. Special Characteristics
VII. General Evaluation

I. ORGANIZATION

Checklist

1. A fundamental theatre arts course is available to all students.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
2. There is flexibility in the organization and scheduling of theatre arts courses.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
3. Theatre arts offerings that carry credit are included in the regularly scheduled school day.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
4. The school's scheduling procedures permit students to participate in performing groups.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
5. Class size is appropriate to the nature of the course offerings.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
6. Talented students may elect courses to form a major sequence in theatre arts.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
7. The assignments of staff reflect the strengths of their professional qualifications.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
8. Time is provided for interdisciplinary planning with teachers of other subjects.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
9. Facilities and instruction beyond regularly scheduled classes are available to interested students.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
10. Innovative programs that reflect the unique qualifications of the department staff are undertaken.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
11. Facilities and staff are assigned to meet school and community needs...	na 1 2 3 4 5
12. Teachers from different grade levels plan together to develop a sequential program in creative dramatics/theatre arts.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
13. Teachers of the same grade level plan together to develop the creative dramatics/theatre arts program at that level.....	na 1 2 3 4 5
14. A budget is provided for supplies, tools, and equipment.....	na 1 2 3 4 5

Supplementary Data

(Complete the following table for all art courses; revise as necessary where schedules are modular, block, or cycle other than weekly; supplement as necessary with attachments.)

Title of Course	Required or Elective	Grade Levels	Enrollment	Credit Value	No. of Sections	Range of Class Size	Per Week	
							Number of Periods (Mods)	Total Min.

1. List and describe briefly the major areas of coordination of the school's curricular and co-curricular theatre arts program.

Evaluations

a) To what extent are theatre arts courses available for all students?.... na 1 2 3 4 5
b) To what extent does flexibility in the scheduling of classes permit students to elect theatre arts courses which they want and need?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

II. NATURE OF OFFERINGS

Checklist

The theatre arts courses and activities:

1. Reflect a logical continuity toward achieving stated goals..... na 1 2 3 4 5
2. Provide in-depth instruction in various areas of theatre..... na 1 2 3 4 5
3. Employ an interdisciplinary approach to the study of theatre arts..... na 1 2 3 4 5
4. Provide students with basic skills and understanding of concepts, media, tools, and equipment..... na 1 2 3 4 5
5. Provide an opportunity for recognition and encouragement of individual achievement..... na 1 2 3 4 5
6. Provide opportunities to study a wide range of drama of various periods, styles, nationalities, forms, playwrights, and media..... na 1 2 3 4 5
7. Provide an opportunity for students to understand the historical and cultural milieu in which the drama being studied was created..... na 1 2 3 4 5
8. Provide an opportunity for talented students to learn to improvise, write, design, and direct..... na 1 2 3 4 5
9. Provide opportunities for students to practice all phases of theatre activity including acting, directing, technical production, and theatre management..... na 1 2 3 4 5
10. Include the study of theatre history, voice and diction, and movement. na 1 2 3 4 5
11. Provide opportunity to cooperate with other departments in presentation of school performances and programs..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Supplementary Data

1. Describe any innovative or unusual phases of course content or teaching methodology.

2. Describe any limitations in the theatre arts offerings.

Evaluations

a) How adequate is provision for breadth as well as depth of instruction in various areas of theatre arts?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
b) How well is the program adapted to meet the individual needs, interests, and abilities of students?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
c) To what degree does the student body show interest in the theatre arts program?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

III. PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Checklist

1. Equipment, materials, and facilities are provided for theatre arts courses and activities..... na 1 2 3 4 5
2. A theatre space suitable for public performance is provided..... na 1 2 3 4 5
3. The theatre space is under the control of the theatre arts specialist with the guaranteed availability of at least two calendar weeks immediately prior to production for set construction and rehearsal..... na 1 2 3 4 5
4. If the theatre arts specialist does not have control over the public performance space, a guaranteed and suitable rehearsal and set construction space is provided..... na 1 2 3 4 5
5. Provision is made in the budget for the purchase and replacement of equipment as necessary..... na 1 2 3 4 5
6. Storage facilities for equipment are provided..... na 1 2 3 4 5
7. A theatre space is available for classroom performance..... na 1 2 3 4 5
8. All performance and storage areas can be locked securely with the theatre arts teacher having access to them..... na 1 2 3 4 5
9. Place a check before those items provided in the teaching-learning stations:

_____Basic stage draperies
_____Standard lighting equipment for flexible illumination of the performance area
_____Hand tools
_____Power tools
_____Construction area
_____Production supplies (makeup, costumes, props, lumber, hardware)
_____Scripts
_____Reference books
_____Video tape equipment
_____Record player
_____Tape recorder
_____Sound equipment
_____Slide projector

Provision is made for a variety of equipment and facility needs..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Supplementary Data

1. What special equipment or facilities not covered above are provided?

2. Describe limitations of the theatre arts program due to lack of facilities or equipment.

III. PHYSICAL FACILITIES--Continued

Evaluations

a) How adequate are space provisions for theatre arts instruction?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
b) How adequate are space facilities for theatre performances?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
c) How adequate are the storage facilities?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

IV. DIRECTION OF LEARNING

A. Instructional Staff

For data on preparation of teachers, see Section II, "Individual Staff Members."

Checklist

Members of the instructional staff:

1. Have earned a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution with a major in drama/theatre or drama education..... na 1 2 3 4 5
2. Have met at least minimum requirements for state certification..... na 1 2 3 4 5
3. Demonstrate awareness of students' needs through ability to stimulate and assist their best efforts..... na 1 2 3 4 5
4. Demonstrate an understanding of continuing development in the theatre. na 1 2 3 4 5
5. Continue education through formal study and other professional activities..... na 1 2 3 4 5
6. Are active in local, state, and national theatre education associations..... na 1 2 3 4 5
7. Are conversant with research literature..... na 1 2 3 4 5
8. Have demonstrated creative ability in theatre arts through production and/or teaching..... na 1 2 3 4 5
9. Have access to a professional library which is maintained by the school..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Supplementary Data

1. Indicate the number of professional staff found in each of the following categories (do not count the same individual more than once in a,b,c, and d, respectively):
   a) Educational level:
   Less than bachelor's degree ____
   Bachelor's degree ____
   Master's degree ____
   Sixth-year program ____
   Doctor's degree ____

b) Semester hours (approximate) of preparation in drama/theatre:

0-11 _____
12-23 _____
24-48 _____
More than 48 _____

c) Years since last formal study in drama/theatre:

0-3 _____
4-7 _____
8-12 _____
More than 12 _____

d) Previous experience in years:

0-2 _____
3-5 _____
6-15 _____
More than 15 _____

2. List areas of concentration in drama/theatre of each staff member.

Evaluations

a) How satisfactory is the general education of the staff?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
b) How satisfactory is the theatrical preparation of the staff?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
c) How adequate is the preparation of the staff for the courses and activities to which they are assigned?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

B. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Checklist

1. Instruction is directed toward clearly stated objectives in theatre education..... na 1 2 3 4 5
2. Students assist in planning, conducting, and evaluating their theatre experiences..... na 1 2 3 4 5
3. Instructional activities show evidence of careful planning and preparation..... na 1 2 3 4 5
4. Work is adapted to individual and group needs, interests, and abilities..... na 1 2 3 4 5
5. Instruction in theatre arts is coordinated with courses in other subject-matter areas..... na 1 2 3 4 5
6. Members of the instructional staff incorporate current practices and developments in theatre arts in their teaching..... na 1 2 3 4 5
7. Students with theatrical aptitude have counseling available on the possibilities of continuing in advanced study..... na 1 2 3 4 5
8. Theatre arts activities provide opportunities for practice in a variety of stagecraft activities..... na 1 2 3 4 5
9. Students are made aware by counselors and teachers of career opportunities in theatre arts..... na 1 2 3 4 5
10. Students are encouraged to participate in and to attend community and professional theatre activities..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Evaluations

a) How adequate is the planning and preparation for instruction?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
b) How well is instruction adapted to needs of individual students?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
c) To what degree are student interests considered in planning and conducting theatre arts courses?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

C. INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Checklist

1. A budget is allocated for instructional resource materials..... na 1 2 3 4 5
2. Textbooks, reference books, and supplementary materials which provide for a variety of theatre interests are available..... na 1 2 3 4 5
3. The school library is supplied with books and periodicals about theatre, as well as recordings and other appropriate materials..... na 1 2 3 4 5
4. A wide variety of audio-visual materials related to theatre is available..... na 1 2 3 4 5
5. The theatre arts teacher selects tools, supplies, and equipment on the basis of quality..... na 1 2 3 4 5
6. Provision is made for the preparation and duplication of materials created by the teaching staff..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Evaluations

a) How adequate is the variety and quality of instructional materials?.... na 1 2 3 4 5
b) How adequate are the tools, supplies, and equipment for a broad program in theatre arts?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

D. METHODS OF EVALUATION

Checklist

1. Procedures have been established to identify students of unusual promise or talent..... na 1 2 3 4 5
2. Student performances are recorded and used in evaluation..... na 1 2 3 4 5
3. Students help to evaluate their individual and group performances..... na 1 2 3 4 5
4. Testing procedures are used for diagnosis as well as measurement..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Supplementary Data

1. Describe, in detail, the departmental procedures for evaluating student work.

Evaluations

a) How well do evaluation procedures help students understand their progress?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
b) How well are program objectives evaluated?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
c) How well is student achievement evaluated?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
d) How well is teaching effectiveness evaluated?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

V. OUTCOMES

Evaluations

a) To what degree do students demonstrate creative ability within and outside the theatre arts program?..... na 1 2 3 4 5
b) How well do students relate theatre arts to other subject areas in the school and to community activities?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

VI. SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE THEATRE ARTS PROGRAM

1. In what respects is the theatre arts program most satisfactory and commendable?

2. In what respects is the theatre arts program most in need of improvement?

3. Recommend, in order of priority, steps for improvement of weaknessess in the theatre arts program.

VII. GENERAL EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION IN THEATRE ARTS

Evaluations

a) To what extent does the instruction in theatre arts meet the needs of students as indicated in Section 2, "School and Community"?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

b) To what extent is the instruction in theatre arts consistent with the philosophy and objectives as developed in Section 3, "Philosophy and Objectives"?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

c) To what extent is the school identifying problems in theatre arts instruction and seeking their solutions?..... na 1 2 3 4 5

Developed by the TEXAS EDUCATIONAL THEATRE ASSOCIATION

Texas Education Agency . Curriculum Development . Fine Arts Section . 1982

GENDER AND ACADEMIC SPECIALIZATION IN GRADUATE THEATRE PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

Philip Emmert and Theodore Clevenger, Jr.

Little is known about staffing and enrollment patterns in theatre programs in the United States. Even less is known about the relative proportions of the two sexes at various levels in these programs, or their perceptions regarding equality of educational or professional opportunity. The present study was developed jointly by ACA and the American Theatre Association to take first steps toward filling this gap in information.

Three questionnaires were developed: (1) A questionnaire for department chairs, (2) one for theatre faculty, and (3) a third for theatre graduate students. A copy of the department chair questionnaire, along with ten of each of the other two, was sent to the chief administrative officer of each theatre program identified on the mailing lists of either ACA or ATA. Chairs were instructed to distribute the other questionnaires to the respective constituencies in their departments, making extra copies if necessary. The combined mailing list included approximately 2500 schools, department, and programs. Questionnaires were returned by 235 department chairs, 130 faculty and 318 graduate students. Although these rates of return are discouragingly low, their results are presented here as the best information presently available concerning a range of issues important to the status of the profession.

I. THE DEPARTMENTS

Two hundred thirty-five department chairs responded to the survey. Of these sixty-one (26%) reported graduate programs.

These sixty-one programs reported current graduate enrollments ranging from one student to 150, with a median of twenty-four graduate students. Collectively the sixty-one departments reported a total graduate enrollment of 1707.

Off-campus programs were reported by forty-one programs (67.2% of all graduate programs) with a median enrollment of five+ and an aggregate enrollment of 352 students.

Table 1 shows enrollment by degree. For the MA, MFA and PhD degrees, the number of schools offering the degree, the range of enrollment size (smallest to largest), median enrollment and total, and aggregate enrollment in all programs of that level are shown. Although MA programs outnumber all others, median enrollment in MFA programs is much higher and the aggregate enrollment in MFA programs nearly equals the total of both MA and PhD combined. The "Other" programs noted in the last column of this table were mostly DFA programs.

Department chairs also reported the number of students enrolled in MA, MFA and PhD programs in each of sixteen areas of specialization within the broad field of theatre. These data are presented in Table 2 which shows, for each of the degree levels and each of the sixteen specializations: (1) the number of departments offering such specialization at that level, (2) the median enrollment in those specializations at that level, and (3) the aggregate number of students in the program/level reported by all universities.

It is apparent that at the MA level the most numerous offerings are Acting (21), Directing (21), All "Academic" Areas (18), Acting/Directing (17) and Costume Design (16). However, the median enrollments in all of the MA programs were surprisingly low. Unless these programs in a given institution were significantly overlapped with one another and with the corresponding MFA and PhD programs, many very small classes would be in evidence and questions of program efficiency might well arise.

The most striking feature of programs at the MFA level is their concentration in a few areas and their total absence from the areas of Theatre History, Dramatic Literature, Theory and Criticism, "Academic" Areas, Theatre Voice, and Theatre Movement. However, MFA programs are both numerous and reasonably well enrolled in Acting, Directing, Design and Management. These data seem to reflect acceptance of the MFA as an artistic/professional degree.

The PhD programs in this sample of departments are neither numerous nor heavily enrolled. The relatively numerous offerings and high enrollments in the traditionally academic areas of theatre history, dramatic literature, theory and criticism underscore the role of the PhD as the special province of academic scholarship. However, it is important to note the not inconsiderable contribution of directing and some aspects of design to the total number of PhD programs and students.

The numbers of male and female graduate students were nearly equal in our sample.

Female enrollment in individual departments ranged from one to sixty-five with a median of nine+. Male enrollments ranged from one to fifty-seven with a median of nine. Altogether 818 male graduate students were reported by the department chairs as contrasted with 836 females for a sex ratio of 50.6% female. It should be noted that this total of 1654 graduate students varies slightly from the 1707 reported above. This discrepancy, and others in this report, result from taking figures from different sections of the questionnaire. Respondents were not required to reconcile their figures and some imprecision is evident in the responses.

No distinction is made in this study between graduate and undergraduate faculty.

The sex distribution of the faculty is quite different from that of the graduate students. The number of female faculty per department ranged from zero to eighteen with a median of about two and an aggregate total of 363. The number of male faculty ranged from zero to twenty-two with a median of almost three and an aggregate total of 670. The faculties of these departments on the average were 65.8% male, representing a pattern of heavy male domination in a field of study populated by students divided about equally between the sexes.

When we turn from faculty to department chairs, the pattern of male domination intensifies. Of the 235 departments reporting, 47.7% were male, 15.3% were female and 37.0% did not report their gender. While one might speculate on the reasons behind more than one third of the sample failing to report gender, it seems fair to say that male chairs outnumber female chairs by a ratio of more than three to one, this in departments where male faculty outnumber female faculty a little less than 2 to 1.

Of the sixty-one graduate programs, only two of the chairs failed to report their gender. Among the fifty-nine remaining programs forty-nine were chaired by males, ten by females for a ratio of nearly five male/chairs of graduate programs for every female chair. Thus the pattern of male domination among graduate departments is substantially greater than that for undergraduate departments.

Taking all fifty-nine programs as a base, there exists an apparent tendency for males to chair larger departments rather than females. Median graduate enrollment for male chairs is twenty-three+, for female chairs it is sixteen+. However, closer examination of the distributions reflects a more complex relationship. Of the nine departments with largest enrollment (fifty or more graduate students each), five are chaired by men, four by women. Male domination is nearly complete in the middle range of enrollment size: for departments with twenty to forty-nine graduate enrollments twenty are chaired by men, only one by a woman.

These data provide little evidence that the sex of the department chair influences the sex distribution of graduate enrollment in a department. Male chairs attracted 52% male enrollment, female chairs attracted 52% female enrollment, an insubstantial difference.

Nor is there convincing evidence that the sex of the department chair influences the sex distribution of departmental faculty. Males chaired departments with 68.6% male faculty, females chaired departments with 71.8% male faculty.

Department chairs were asked to anticipate their recruitment needs for the next two academic years, 1982-83 and 1983-84, as to both numbers and areas of specialization sought. Most departments (71.1%) anticipated no recruiting for 1982-83. The majority of the remainder (17.9%) expected to fill just one position. Only eleven departments anticipated more than two positions, but the heavy recruitment needs of two or three departments brought the aggregate positions to 154.

In the aggregate chairs anticipated some need for most of the sixteen areas of specialization in Table 2. The greatest demand was for teachers of Acting (n=14), with three other specializations showing ten or more expected positions: costume design, technical direction and Other. Most of the "Other" positions were identified as fields often linked to theatre such as speech, dance, TV/film and visual arts. Medium demand (five to nine positions) was reported for acting, directing, and theatre voice. The majority of specializations could expect low demand (one to four positions). Only two fields were predicted to experience no demand from departments in this sample: dramatic theory and criticism and all "academic" areas.

Very few departments could foresee recruitment for the 1983-84 year (17.3%). About half of these (8.5%) expected only one position, and only thirteen departments expected more than two positions. Aggregate demand was set at 121 positions for 1983-84.

The greatest expected demand in 1983-84 was for "other" specializations (n=12). No other specialization exceeded ten positions. Medium demand (five to nine positions) was expected for directing and technical direction. The majority of specialities could anticipate one to four positions. However, no demand was projected for costume design, dramatic literature, dramatic theory and criticism, theatre management, or theatre voice.

These demand analyses, especially the two-year projections, should be interpreted with due caution. Resignations and retirements are not always predictable far in advance and new positions are usually created only after budget projections are released, sometimes only weeks before the opening of the academic year. Moreover, this sample represents less than half the number of theatre schools and departments. Even so, the enormous gap between the number of students currently enrolled in these graduate theatre programs and the number of academic positions projected for the two-year period may alert both advisors and prospective graduate students to a highly competitive job market ahead.

II. THE FACULTIES

Only 130 faculty members returned the faculty questionnaire, representing something less than a 13% rate of response. Because the results from this small sample offer some suggestive findings they are summarzied here; however it should be noted that con-

clusions based on such a low return rate must be interpreted with care.

Women faculty made up 30.4% of this sample, roughly in proportion to the present female faculty noted in the department chair report.

Faculty were asked to indicate their preparation to teach each of fifteen areas of specialization. Areas ranked one or two were identified as "strong preference" and areas not ranked were identified as "not prepared to teach." Some faculty ranked as many as eight of the fifteen specialized fields as areas which they might teach. Most ranked three or four. Table 3 summarizes the faculty responses.

It is apparent that the most popular preferences by far are acting (50%) and directing (50.6%), with dramatic literature (33.3%) and theatre history (30.3%) running a poor third and fourth in rank of all areas for strong preference. On the other hand, literature and history top the list of secondary preferences with 25.8% each.

When these preferences are separated according to the gender of the respondent, a pattern of differences emerges. In spite of their representing a minority of the sample, female faculty members are especially heavily represented in the fields of costume design (68%), all "academic" areas (52.4%) and theatre voice (48.6%). On the other hand, men dominate directing (82.3%), scene design (80%), lighting and sound design (81.4%) and total design (78.3%).

A large majority of faculty in this sample were responsible for directing plays, at least occasionally. Fifty-three percent directed one-act plays, 72.7% directed mainstage productions, 48.5% reported directing experimental theatre productions. Apparently the dominant trend is toward two or more directing assignments per year:

25.8% directed three or more plays per year
27.3% directed twice a year
16.7% directed once a year
3.0% directed every other year
9.1% directed occasionally
18.2% did not direct plays

When asked whether they "felt discriminated against on the basis of gender" two-thirds of the female faculty responded "yes," along with a handful of male faculty (2%). A pattern of male dominance could be found in frequency of directing assignments. Male faculty were three times more likely to be assigned to direct three or more plays per year; female faculty were three times more likely to be assigned to direct no plays.

When asked to identify how they had been made the object of discrimination, women identified the following:

Salary lower than males in same position - 19.8%
Promotion denied or delayed longer than normal - 15.6%
Not listened to in meeting as much as male faculty - 11.7%
Less support for projects - 7.8%
Opportunity to serve in responsible positions - 3.9%
Not appointed to desired committees as often as males - 3.9%
Other factors - 1.9%

Most female faculty identified one or two of the above factors. It is apparent that while economic and security issues predominate, the pattern of perceived sex discrimination on the part of faculty women in theatre is diverse.

III. THE GRADUATE STUDENTS

Three hundred eighteen graduate students returned completed questionnaires, 43.4% male and 51.6% female (with 5% not responding to the question). Of these 106 (33.3%) reported pursuing MA degrees, 144 (45.3%) were in MFA programs and fifty-six (17.6%) were pursuing the PhD. These figures are in rough proportion to those reported by the department chairs and emphasize the major role played by the MFA in graduate theatre education.

The graduate students' reported areas of specialization parallelled closely those reported by the department chairs and theatre faculty, as is evident from examination of Table 4.

Most of the graduate students are considering at least two possible career plans after completing the degree for which they are currently enrolled. About 16.4% look forward to further graduate study. Fifty-six percent plan to teach. Almost half (49.1%) plan to try the professional theatre, and 10% have "Other Plans."

The distribution of areas of specialization between the sexes was reminiscent of that of the faculty. Although men slightly outnumber women in the sample, men dominate the fields of directing (58%), scene design (69%), lighting (66%) and total design (88%), while female graduate students predominate in costume (89%), all "academic" areas (62%) and management (62%). The other areas of specialization are divided approximately in proportion to the percentages of men and women in the sample, reflecting no sex bias in those areas of specialization.

When asked whether they perceive "any career opportunities closed to you because of your gender," the graduate students responded in an interesting way. Only thirty-one students (9.7%) replied "yes" compared to 89.0% "no;" only sixteen students (5%) declined to answer the question. Broken down by gender of the respondent, 18.8% of the women replied "yes," while 2.4% of the men did so. Although the female graduate students were clearly more inclined than their male counterparts to foresee career discrimination based on gender, fewer than one-fifth were so inclined. The female graduate students appear much more optimistic in assessing their career prospects than are their faculty counterparts in assessing their current status.

IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Data from three survey instruments sent to approximately 2500 theatre programs offer some insight into staffing and enrollment patterns as well as perceptions of professional and educational opportunity. Within the general caveats imposed by low rates of return on all three instruments the following observations may be made.

Although programs taken as a whole enjoy

moderately healthy enrollments (median = 24), breakdown into academic levels (MA, MFA, PhD) shows weak enrollments in MA programs (median = 6.5%). Further, breakdown into areas of academic specialization within the broad field of theatre show very small median enrollments in all programs, including the MFA. Unless programs are substantially overlapped, low enrollments could become an object of administrative concern.

MFA programs tend to avoid the traditionally "academic" specializations and to concentrate on artistic/professional aspects of theatre. Conversely, the PhD concentrates heavily on the academic areas, with a scattering of programs and enrollments in technical theatre and directing. MA programs tend to walk a line between the two, partaking somewhat of each.

Male and female graduate students are reported in nearly equal proportions by department chairs, although our student sample showed a somewhat higher percentage of females. There is a distinct pattern of specialization by gender within the various sub-disciplines of the theatre major.

The faculties of theatre programs show a pattern of male domination. Men outnumber women on the faculties by about two-to-one. Department chairs are even more heavily male-dominated than are the faculties: male chairs outnumber female chairs about three-to-one. The dominance is even more pronounced for graduate departments: there are five male chairs of graduate departments for every female chair. The pattern of male dominance is virtually complete among departments of moderate size (twenty to forty-nine graduate students) with twenty males chairing such departments to one female. On the other hand, among the largest departments (fifty or more students) the number of female chairs is about equal to the number of males.

Foreseeable demand for new theatre faculty was not great for the years 1982-83 and 1983-84, demand in both years totalling 275. Some demand was anticipated for most areas of specialization with greatest demand in acting, costume design, technical direction, directing and a potpourri of related "other" disciplines.

Most theatre faculty direct plays regularly, a majority at least twice per year. Men are more likely to have heavy directing assignments than are women. Among theatre faculty a pattern of gender specialization emerges with a similar pattern pervading the interests of graduate students. A majority of female faculty feel themselves the object of sex discrimination. This concern focuses most heavily on economic and security issues but touches a wide range of professional and workplace issues as well.

A high percentage of theatre graduate students expect to teach, and almost half plan to try for a career in professional theatre. About one-sixth look forward to further graduate study.

Female graduate students are more optimistic about career prospects than are female theatre faculty. Though women are much more likely than men to perceive some careers closed to them because of their gender, fewer than one-fifth of all female graduate students in theatre are so inclined.

Endnote

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Gladys Crane, former chair of the Women's Program of ATA, for invaluable assistance in drafting the questionnaires used in this study and Mary Jane Shadowen for consultation in computer processing of the results, and to Patti Gillespie and the Women's Program of ATA for financial support.

Table 1

Enrollment by Degree Level

	MA	MFA	PhD	Other
Number of Departments	53	31	20	5
Enrollment Range	1-99	1-112	1-103	2-89
Median Enrollment	6.5	27	14.5	12
Total Students	953	1149	357	216

Table 2

Incidence of and Enrollment in
Areas of Specialization by Degree Level

	MA			MFA			PhD		
	No.	Med.	Total	No.	Med.	Total	No.	Med.	Total
Acting	21	3.0	79	19	8.5	121	0	0	0
Directing	21	2.5	78	23	5.5	125	6	2.0	18
Acting/Directing	17	3.0	73	9	1.5	33	4	3.0	11
Costume Design	16	1.5	32	18	3.0	66	4	1.0	5
Scene Design	15	2.0	26	13	3.5	54	3	1.5	7
Light & Sound Design	3	2.0	6	8	1.5	11	4	1.5	6
Total Design	7	1.5	17	14	6.0	87	1	1.0	1
Theatre History	13	1.5	34	0	0	0	8	8.5	58
Dramatic Literature	6	2.0	12	0	0	0	5	4.5	20
Dramatic Theory & Criticism	12	1.5	31	0	0	0	8	7.5	54
All "Academic" Areas	18	4.0	83	0	0	0	7	4.0	36
Theatre Management	8	2.0	18	7	5.0	37	1	1.0	1
Theatre Voice	1	9.0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Theatre Movement	1	1.0	1	0	0	0	1	1.0	1
Technical Direction	7	1.0	11	6	2.0	14	5	2.0	23
Other	18	3.0		62	6.5	59	6	2.0	19

Table 3

Faculty Areas of Specialization

	% Strong Preference	% Secondary Preference	% Not Prepard To Teach
Acting	50.0	12.1	37.9
Directing	50.6	22.0	27.3
Costume Design	4.5	1.5	93.9
Scene Design	9.1	3.0	87.9
Total Design	9.1	1.5	89.4
Lighting & Sound Design	7.6	4.5	87.9
Theatre History	30.3	25.8	43.9
Dramatic Literature	33.3	25.8	40.9
Dramatic Theory & Criticism	24.3	19.6	56.1
All "Academic" Areas	9.1	7.5	86.4
Theatre Management	7.5	6.1	86.4
Theatre Movement	4.5	0	95.5
Theatre Voice	3.0	6.1	90.9
Technical Direction	7.5	4.6	87.9
Other	12.1	4.6	83.3

Table 4

Specializations of Theatre Graduate Students

	Number	Percent
Acting	79	24.8
Directing	84	26.4
Acting/Directing	51	16.0
Costume Design	31	9.8
Scenic Design	37	11.6
Lighting/Sound Design	24	7.5
Total Design	12	3.8
Theatre History	16	5.0
Dramatic History	5	1.5
Dramatic Literature	11	3.5
Dramatic Theory & Criticism	13	4.1
All "Academic" Areas	28	8.8
Theatre Management	22	6.9
Theatre Voice	22	5.7
Theatre Movement	7	2.2
Technical Direction	15	4.7
Other	52	16.4

SOME LEGAL CONCLUSIONS REGARDING NON-RENEWAL AND DISMISSAL

Dennis J. Sporre

I propose to look at some of the legal considerations that adhere to promotion and tenure standards. Although some legal issues may exist within standards themselves, I am concerned with questions of legality as they relate specifically to decision-making, that is, to applying promotion and tenure standards. Moreover, because I know of no case in which a positive decision was taken to court, I will be referring only to negative decisions. Legal considerations are a real, if unfortunate, part of the implementation of standards. As with any formal, legal issue, the ground is mushy, the history, clouded, and the rules, complex.

By enumerating some basic principles in promotion and tenure law and by citing the conclusions of a few recent cases, I shall try to suggest what administrators, promotion-and-tenure-committee members, and/or untenured faculty need to know in order to function properly and knowledgeably in their roles. Obviously I can provide no definitive answers, but I can isolate some points from which we can take future bearings. As always, we should use caution in attempting to apply general legal principles to specific situations.

As has been written about the legal situation between employers and employees: *The law of employment between an institution of higher education and its faculty is defined by an increasingly complex network of legal principles and theories. The core of the relationship is defined by the principles of contract law which essentially is state law, but that core is encircled by aspects of employment discrimination law, constitutional law, labor law, and state and federal statutes and regulations.*[1]

I, thus, will refer but little to state law simply because of its diversity. For example, in the question of libel: in North Carolina, if the comments were made within the context of the functioning of a state institution, the issue would not be a legal one; instead, it would be the province of the North Carolina Industrial Commission, which reports to the State Attorney General. Federal cases tend to be more interesting because they do hinge on more broadly applicable constitutional principles, although, as we shall see, federal decisions are not always crystal clear or consistent.

In general, the courts have been very tentative in exploring the limits to which judicial deference should be extended in academic decisions. In essence, so long as internally established procedures have been followed (and occasionally when they have not), the courts have stated that even a bad decision is legal as long as the procedure used in reaching the decision was correct. For example, I recently heard of, but cannot document, one case in which the courts upheld a non-renewal (tenure denial) case solely on the basis of a faculty committee's decision and statement that "this person is not a productive member of our work group." In *Davis v. Weidner* (7th cir., 1979) the court discussed what is called "the extraordinary deference" afforded by some courts to the judgment of university decision-makers. Although recognizing the legitimacy of the university's desire to avoid judicial intrusion into academic matters, the court feared that lack of scrutiny could immunize higher education from, in this case, Title VII, immunization which clearly was not intended by Congress.

What then can we discern from the courts regarding application of standards, evaluation, and decision-making? Standards, essentially, are internally derived. They are recognized by the courts as being subjective (*David v. Weidner*); and as long as they are applied with procedural fairness, the courts will hold in a university's favor. However, individuals filing lawsuits traditionally have tried to mingle standards with constitutional issues, most often First Amendment Rights and with Contractural or Property Interests.

First Amendment Rights. A key issue in cases concerning free speech is the nature and burden of proof. In this area three cases provide significant information. In *Lieberman v. Gant*[2] the plaintiff claimed that an adverse tenure ruling was in retaliation for her efforts to improve the status of women at the university. The important conclusions from the case were the court's rulings (referring to *Givhan* and *Mt. Healthy*) that

it was necessary for the plaintiff to prove that her political activities were not only a "primary" factor in the decision, but that tenure would have been awarded to her but for her political activities. The burden of proof placed upon the plaintiff required proof that the constitutionally protected conduct was a substantial factor in the University's decision, the burden then shifting to the university to show that it would have reached the same decision even in the absence of the protected conduct.[3]

In this case the court found for the defendants:

In *Cooper v. Ross*[4] a district court found that protected conduct was a sustantial or motivating factor. The burden of proof then shifted to the university to show that it would have reached the same decision in the absence of such conduct. The court found in favor of the plaintiff in this case holding that *the paucity of evidence on the university's part to support its reasons implied that the reasons were hastily prepared, make weight reasons and did not reflect its true motivation.*[5] These two cases illustrate the shifting nature of the burden of proof in first amendment cases. In a third case, *Marwil v. Baker*,[6] the court further specified that the plaintiff must prove that he in fact engaged in protected speech.

Another question of constitutional rights is whether representatives of state agencies are being protected from suit or damages because they are agents of a state. In *Berry v. Arthur*[7] action was brought against members of the board of regents, commissioners of higher education, and various University of South Dakota officials for deprivation of salary and promotion. A pertinent issue in this case was the defendants' motion to dismiss charges on the grounds that action was barred against the individual defendants by virtue of the Eleventh Amendment. The court denied the motion stating that

when state officials act under state law in violation of the United States constitution, the state has no power to shield the defendants with its immunity; that such officers are stripped of their official character and subjected to the consequences of their conduct; and that it was not inevitable that any damages awarded in the action would be paid by the state.[8]

Contractual or Property Interests. Three cases illustrate some issues of protected property and liberty interests, *vis a vis* non-renewal of contract and tenure denial. In *Carr v. Board of Trustees of the University of Akron*,[9] the plaintiff sued for property rights to a full five-year probationary period unless terminated for cause. The court ruled that such circumstances did not constitute a constitutionally protected interest.[10] In *Clark v. Whiting*[11] the court held that with regard to promotions, unless some statute, ordinance, or institutional regulations were present, promotion denial does not constitute property entitlement.[12] In the case, again, of *Lieberman v. Gant*,[13]

the court found that each appointment on a one-year contract was limited to a term of one year, and that university procedures specified that only tenured faculty members were entitled to protection against discharge, limiting the university's ability to terminate tenured faculty except for cause. It held that as an untenured teacher, plaintiff had no legitimate claim of entitlement to continued employment beyond the contract year, and, thus, no property interest in her job once that term was concluded.[14]

The issue of procedures in decision-making may or may not be troublesome, but in dealing with failure to follow internal procedures the Vermont State Supreme Court ruled in *Nzoma v. Vermont State College*[15] that the College's failure to follow its own procedures in dismissing an untenured faculty member did not affect the final decision, and, therefore, did not deprive the plaintiff of a property right.[16]

Dinnan and Gray. The final set of cases to be considered are the celebrated *Dinnan* case and a similar but conflicting case, *Gray v. City University of N.Y.* The important issues raised in these two cases are peer review, academic freedom, and legal accountability.

The United State Supreme Court refused to review the contempt-of-court conviction of James A. Dinnan, who went to jail rather than reveal how he voted in a tenure case. The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals had ruled that the right to academic freedom must be limited by other societal goals and that the confidentiality of tenure decisions cannot be used to give an institution of higher learning *carte blanche* to practice discrimination. The case stemmed from the suit of a female faculty member who had contended that she was denied tenure because she was a woman. The appeal court ruled that if Dinnan *was unwilling to accept responsibility for his actions, he should never have taken part in the tenure decision-making process.* [17]

The *Dinnan* case is in conflict with the ruling of United States District Court Judge Lawrence W. Pierce of New York in the case of *Gray v. City University of N.Y.* Gray sought to discover the votes of two of the defendants in the case. The defendants refused. The plaintiff asked the court to compel their response, and the defendants filed a cross motion for a protection order. Judge Pierce ruled for the defendants on this issue, stating that

the peer review system has evolved as the most reliable method for assuring promotion of the candidate best qualified to serve the needs of the institution . . . . The maintenance of the confidentiality of the decision making process is generally an integral element of a peer review system for granting or withholding tenure.[18]

These cases serve as illustrations of directions taken in recent court decisions and provide us with some useful guideposts. Each was far more complex than my brief summary suggests, however, and further enlightenment can be gained from studying the summaries of the individual cases.

Endnotes

[1]Thomas N. Jones, "Employees," *The Yearbook of Higher Education Law, 1981* D. Parker Young, ed. (Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Proglems of Education), p. 48.

[2]474 F. Supp. 848 (D. Conn. 1979).
[3]Thomas S. Biggs, Jr., "Employees," *The Yearbook of Higher Education Law, 1980*, D. Parker Young, ed. (Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education), p. 71.
[4]472 F. Supp. 807 (E.D. Ark. 1979).
[5]Biggs, p. 74.
[6]499 F. Supp. 560 (E.D. Mich. 1980)
[7]474 F. Supp. 427 (D.S.D. 1979).
[8]Biggs, p. 84.
[9]465 F. Supp. 886 (N.D. Ohio 1979).
[10]Biggs, p. 92
[11]607 F. 2d 634 (4th Cir. 1979)
[12]Biggs, p. 96097.
[13]474 F. Supp. 848 (D. Conn. 1979).
[14]Biggs. P. 90.
[15]411 A. 2d 1366 (Vt. 1980).
[16]Jones, p. 71.
[17]"Confidentiality and Tenure Decisions: Opinions of 2 Courts," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, XXIII, no. 15 (December 9, 1981), p. 10.
[18]*Ibid.* This case is now on appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

FACULTY CIVIL RIGHTS: JUDICIAL REVIEW OF HIRING, DISMISSAL, NON-RENEWAL, PROMOTION, AND TENURE DECISIONS

Gregory B. Adams

Although courts traditionally have been reluctant to review the wisdom of faculty personnel decisions, they have been willing to protect faculty members who have been dismissed, whose contracts have not been renewed, or who have been denied promotion or tenure from the university's use of improper procedures or reliance upon impermissible criteria in making the adverse decision.[1] Additionally, the courts have enforced the contractual rights of the aggrieved faculty member just as they would those of any employee. However, the scope of this judicial protection has been narrow, and usually the judicial deference granted to the university's decision has been decisive. Unless contractual rights have been violated, the faculty member must show that he or she had a right to a hearing or other procedural safeguards which were not provided or that the decision was based upon factors which the university could not legally consider.

The right to a hearing, before a dismissal or non-renewal decision is made, exists only when provided by the faculty member's contract, by institutional rules, policies, or practices, by state law, or by federal regulation.[2] The right to a hearing under the first three sources, varies significantly from state to state and institution to institution. The United States Constitution, specifically the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, usually is the basis relied upon in claiming the right to a fair hearing. However, there are two severe limitations upon the use of the Due Process Clause. First, it only limits action by a state, and thus only applies to public colleges and universities. Second, it only protects a person against deprivation of life, liberty, or the property without due process of law.[3] Because dismissal during the contractual term deprives the faculty member of property rights under the contract, it is subject to the constitutional right to a hearing.[4] Non-renewal of an untenured faculty member's contract usually is not;[5] the Fourteenth Amendment only requires a hearing (1) if the faculty member has acquired tenure or a status which the court perceives to be equivalent,[6] (2) if the university publically makes damaging charges against the faculty member,[7] or (3) if the non-renewal imposes upon the faculty member a stigma or other disability that forcloses his or her freedom to take advantage of other employment opportunities.[8]

Until recently, most cases reviewing the propriety of the criteria used in university personnel decisions involved claims of academic freedom. In private universities such claims must be based upon contractual provisions or institutional rules, policies, or practices, frequently including AAUP principles.[9] In public universities they have, in addition, a constitutional base.[10] The First Amendment protects freedom of speech, petition, assembly, religion, and association from federal interference; the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits state infringement of these guarantees. Constitutionally based academic freedom claims may be asserted by any faculty member, tenured or not.[11]

State universities may not base decisions of dismissal, non-renewal, or denial of tenure or promotion upon the faculty member's exercise of constitutionally protected rights.[12] For example, a university may not dismiss a faculty member for testifying before a legislative committee in favor or a proposal opposed by the university's Board of Regents,[13] for publically criticizing the university administration,[14] or for distributing political leaflets on campus.[15] If the university has considered such protected conduct in deciding against the faculty member, the decision will be upheld only if the university can prove that had it considered only permissible criteria it would have reached the same conclusion.[16] Otherwise, a decision based upon impermissible criteria cannot stand.

A significant expansion of faculty civil rights occurred in 1972 with the extension of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to cover public and private colleges and universities; prior to 1972, educational institutions were exempt from the Title VII prohibition of employment discrimination.[17] When Congress changed that, it added race, color, religion, national origin, and gender to the list of impermissible criteria.[18] Faculty hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions based on these impermissible grounds are subject to challenge in the federal courts.

Although the opponents of racial and sexual discrimination hoped for quick, significant victories, they were soon disappointed.[19] Early cases showed extreme judicial deference to university decisions; judges seemed too awed by the academics to seriously inquire whether the challenged decisions were based upon the faculty member's race or gender.[20] The promise of Title VII went unfulfilled during the 1970's.[21]

A number of cases indicate that the

judicial attitude is changing. In 1974 the Second Circuit United States Court of Appeals in *Faro v. New York University* wrote that *education and faculty appointments at a university level are probably the least suited for federal court supervision.*[22] Many courts interpreted this to mean that courts should exercise only minimal scrutiny of college and university employment practices.[23] *This anti-interventionist policy has rendered colleges and universities virtually immune to charges of employment bias, at least where that bias is not expressed overtly.*[24] In 1978 the Second Circuit retreated from its position in *Faro*, expressing fear that it had been pressed beyond all reasonable limits of the Civil Rights Act: *Faro does not, and never was intended to, indicate that academic freedom embraces the freedom to discriminate.*[25] It is particularly instructive to note that the court, in explaining its change of attitude, emphasized that *The pervasive nature of discriminatory university employment practices has been well documented in the literature, and was characterized in the Congressional debates preceding the passage of the 1972 amendments as "truly appalling," "gross" and "blatant."*

It is clear beyond cavil, then, that the Congress has evidenced particular concern for the problem of employment bias in an academic setting. Indeed it might be said that far from taking an anti-interventionist position with respect to the academy, the Congress has instructed us to be particularly sensitive to evidence of academic bias.[26]

Similarly, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in 1980 abandoned its 1973 reticence[27] to intervene in a university personnel decision that a faculty member claimed was based on her gender.[28] During this same period other courts, including the United State Supreme Court[29] and the Courts of Appeals for the First,[30] Third,[31] Fourth,[32] Seventh,[33] and Ninth Circuits,[34] held that universities are to be subject to the same type of inquiry and degree of scrutiny as are other employers charged with racial, ethnic, sexual, or religious discrimination. The age of broad judicial deference to academic employment decision-making is ending; although still hesitant to substitute their judgment of a professor's credentials for the judgment of the faculty, judges now carefully inspect those decisions for evidence of illegal discrimination.[35] The central issue in most Title VII cases is whether the university's claimed legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for the adverse decision is merely pretext.[36] In most recent decisions, the courts have carefully inquired into the entire record to determine whether the reasons given were pretextual.[37] For example, in *Sweeney v. Board of Trustees of Keene State College* the court reviewed the college's asserted reasons for denying promotion and tenure to one of its education professors, characterizing them as bordering on calling her a "school marm."[38] The court found the college's claims unpersuasive:

The nature of the reasons given, and the evidence introduced to show that they were either insubstantial or fictitious, stood with more general evidence suggesting that women at Keene State were evaluated by a stricter standard than their male colleagues, and that the institution generally was unresponsive to the concerns of its female faculty.[39]

The court accepted statistics to show a general atmosphere of discrimination as did the court in *Lynn v. Regents of the University of California*, which noted that statistics are especially useful in academic cases.[40]

Some universities have attempted to prevent courts from investigating whether the claimed reasons were pretextual by claiming that the information needed to make that determination was confidential and should not be revealed. A few lower courts have protected the confidentiality of information in personnel files[41] or the identity of committee members voting against the candidate[42] when information the faculty member needed to prove her/his case was available from other sources. However, the Courts of Appeals that have considered the question have held that a faculty member has a right to obtain the information if it would be helpful in proving a case or was relied upon, directly or inferentially, by the university in demonstrating that the decision was based on permissible criteria. In the celebrated *Dinnan* case, in which Judge Clark found the defendant's antics irresponsible, not heroic or noble,[44] the court held that no privilege exists which would protect a member of a university review committee from revealing how he/she voted;[45] to claim that such a privilege is based on academic freedom is to twist the concept to destroy the values it was created to protect.[46] In addition, the court wrote: *Though we recognize the importance of academic freedom, we must also recognize its limits. The public policy of the United States prohibits discrimination; Professor Dinnan and the University of Georgia are not above that policy. To rule otherwise would mean that the concept of academic freedom would give any institution of higher learning a carte blanche to practice discrimination of all types.*[47]

This ruling is in accord with those in *Keyes v. Lenoir Rhyne College*,[48] *Jepsen v. Florida Board of Regents*,[49] and *Lynn v. Regents of the University of California*.[50] Thus, courts can be expected frequently to grant the faculty member access to confidential personnel information in faculty files and to require committee members to disclose how they voted and to give their reasons.

Another indication of the change in judicial attitude toward academic discrimination cases is the frequency with which courts have been allowing suits to be brought on behalf of a class of all of the victims of discrimination at a university. Recently class actions charging sex discrimination have been allowed to proceed against Temple University,[51] Oregon State University,[52] University of Houston,[53] University of Texas at Dallas,[54] Lenoir Rhyne College,[55] Swarthmore College,[56] Brown University,[57] and Montana State University.[58] The Courts' decisions to allow these cases to be tried as class actions are significant for two reasons: (1) the use of statistics and examples to prove widespread, systematic discrimination has a more direct impact on the outcome in a class action suit by an individual, and (2) the remedy granted in a university-wide class action may be far more

sweeping and effective in eliminating future discrimination and remedying the effects of past discrimination. For example, in *Mecklenberg v. Montana State University*,[59] the court permitted the case to proceed as a class action and found a pattern of sex discrimination against the class of female faculty members as well as the individual plaintiffs, specifically, and encouraged the university and the women to settle the matter.[60] They did, with the settlement providing salary adjustments to eliminate the discrepancies, awards of back pay, and promotion of Mecklenberg to associate professor.[61] A similar result followed the court's certification of the class action in *Lamphere v. Brown University*.[62] The settlement in that case was embodied in a court decree establishing an Affirmative Action Monitoring Committee to prevent future discrimination, a $400,000 fund to compensate victims of discrimination, and a Hearing Panel to determine entitlement to compensation from the fund.[63] Three of the individual plaintiffs were granted tenure, and the fourth received a cash settlement.[64] It has been estimated that Brown University spent more than a million dollars to fight the suit before settling.[65] Even more significant, potentially, is the consent decree entered against the University of Minnesota to settle the class action brought against it by Shyamala Rajender.[66] It provided a cash settlement, established hiring quotas, and appointed a special master to hear all sex discrimination claims until 1989;[67] the master has the power to award cash damages, faculty positions, and tenure.[68] Estimates of the benefits to claimants during that period range upward from $735,000.[69]

In cases that are not settled, courts frequently find illegal discrimination and grant relief to aggrieved faculty members. The most common remedy is awarding damages to compensate for the pay lost due to the discriminatory salary disparity or denial of a promotion or a raise because of gender or race. These damages can be substantial: Mary Alice Hill was awarded $65,000 in damages from Colorado State University, the chairman, the acting chairman, and certain members of her department.[70] She had charged the university with sex discrimination in violation of Title VII and the individuals with conspiring to violate her constitutional rights. Courts also frequently enjoin guilty universities from continuing their discriminatory practices.[71] During the pendency of the suit, the courts may enjoin the university from dismissing the faculty member.[72] One of the most sweeping decisions to date is *Kunda v. Muhlenberg College*[73] in which the court ordered reinstatement, back pay for the period from termination until reinstatement, retroactive promotion, and tenure if Kunda obtained a master's degree within two years.[74] She obrained the degree and was awarded tenure.[75]

The conclusions which can be drawn from the recent cases are significant. Faculty members are beginning to win Title VII cases. Courts are granting access to confidential personnel files which contain information which the faculty member needs or upon which the university relies. Committee members may be required to explain their votes. Statistics are being used to discover patterns of discrimination. In sum, courts have become sensitive to employment discrimination in academia; they recognize gender and race as impermissible criteria, with the victims of discrimination being entitled to at least as much protection as is afforded those whose rights of academic freedom have been infringed. Although judges will not substitute their judgment for the university's about whether a faculty member meets legitimate, albeit subjective, standards, courts will carefully review challenged decisions to ensure that proper procedures have been used and improper criteria have not.

Endnotes

[1]See generally, William A. Kaplin, *The Law of Higher Education: Legal Implications of Administrative Decision Making* (San Francisco: Joseey-Bass Publishers, 1978), Chapter 3.

[2]*Ibid.*, Section 3.5.

[3]*Board of Regents v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564 (1972); *Perry v. Sindermann*, 408 U.S. 593 (1972); Kaplin, Section 3.5.2.

[4]*Board of Regents v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 567 (1972); Kaplin, 138.

[5]*Board of Regents v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 564 (1972); *Perry v. Sindermann*, 408 U.S. 593, 599 (1972).

[6]*Perry v. Sindermann*, 408 U.S. 593, 599-603 (1972).

[7]*Board of Regents v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 573 (1972).

[8]*Ibid.*, 573-74.

[9]Kaplin, Section 3.6. See, e.g., *Skehan v. Board of Trustees*, 501 F. 2d 31 (3d Cir. 1976).

[10]*Ibid.*

[11]*Perry v. Sindermann*, 408 U.S. 593, 596-98 (1972).

[12]*Ibid.*; Kaplin, 157-58.

[13]*Perry v. Sindermann*, 408 U.S. 593 (1972).

[14]*Ibid.*; *Smith v. Losee*, 485 F. 2d 334 (10th Cir. 1973); *Starsky v. Williams*, 353 F. Supp. 900 (D. Ariz. 1972) Aff'd in Pertinent Part, 512, F. 2n 109 (9th Cir. 1975).

[15]*Starsky v. Williams*, 353 F. Supp. 900 (D. Ariz. 1972), Aff'd in Pertinent Part, 512 F. 2d 109 (9th Cir. 1075).

[16]*Mt. Healthy City School District Board of Education v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274 (1977); *Franklin v. Atkins*, 562 F. 2d 1188 (10th Cir. 1977).

[17]See Joel William Friedman, "Congress, the Courts, and Sex-Based Employment Discrimination in Higher Education: A Tale of Two Titles," 34, *Vanderbilt Law Review* 37, 38 (1981) and "Comment, Academic Freedom v. Title VIII: Will Equal Employment Opportunity Be Denied on Campus?,"

[18]42 U.S.C.A. §2000e-2 (1981).

[19]Friedman, 38-39.

[20]*See, e.g., Faro v. New York University*, 502 F.2d 1229 (2nd Cir. 1974) and *Green v. Board of Regents of Texas Tech University*, 474 F.2d 594 (5th Cir. 1073).

[21]Friedman, 47-48; Jennie Farley, *Academic Women and Employment Discrimination: A Critical Annotated Bibliography* (Cornell Industrial and Labor Relations Bibliography Series, No. 16; Ithaca, N.Y.: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1982), 1-7.

[22]502 F.2d 1229, 1231-32 (2d Cir. 1974).

[23]*Powell v. Syracuse University*, 580 F.2d 1150, 1153 (2d Cir. 1978).

[24]*Ibid.*

[25]*Ibid.*, 1154.

[26]*Ibid.* (footnotes omitted).

[27]*Green v. Board of Regents of Texas Tech University*, 474 F.2d 594, 596 (5th Cir. 1973).

[28]*Jepsen v. Florida Board of Regents*, 610 F.2d 1379, 1383 (5th Cir. 1980).

[29]*Board of Trustees v. Sweeney*, 439 U.S. 24 (1978).

[30]*Sweeney v. Board of Trustees*, 604 F.2d 106 (1st Cir. 1979).

[31]*Kunda v. Muhlenberg College*, 621 F.2d 532 (3d Cir. 1980).

[32]*Smith v. University of North Carolina*, 632 F.2d 316 (4th Cir. 1980).

[33]*Davis v. Weidner*, 596 F.2d 726 (7th Cir. 1979).

[34]*Lynn v. Regents of the University of California*, 656 F.2d 1337 (1981).

[35]*Davis v. Weidner*, 596 F.2d 726, 731-32 (7th Cir. 1979).

[36]*Lynn v. Regents of the University of California*, 656 F.2d 1337, 1341-45 (9th Cir. 1981) citing *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792, 807 (1973).

[37]*E.g. Smith v. University of North Carolina*, 632 F.2d 316 (4th Cir. 1980).

[38]604 F.2d 106, 112 (1st Cir. 1979).

[39]*Ibid.*, 112-13.

[40]656 F.2d 1337, 1342 (9th Cir. 1981).

[41]*McKillop v. Regents of University of California*, 386 F.Supp. 1270 (N.D. Calif. 1975).

[42]*Gray v. Board of Higher Education, City of New York*, 92 F.R.D. 87 (S.D.N.Y. 1981).

[43]In re Dinnan, 661 F.2d 426 (5th (now 11th) Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 50 U.S.L.W. 3963 (June 7, 1982); *Lynn v. Regents of the University of California*, 656 F.2d 1337, 1345-47 (9th Cir. 1981); *Jepsen v. Florida Board of Regents*, 610 F.2d 1379, 1384-85 (5th Cir. 1980); *Keyes v. Lenoir Rhyne College*, 552 F.2d 579, 581 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 904 (1977).

[44]661 F.2d 426, 432 (5th Cir. 1981).

[45]*Ibid.* 427, noting at page 432 that *society has no strong interest in encouraging timid faculty members to serve on tenure committees.*

[46]*Ibid.*, 430

[47]*Ibid.*, 431

[48]552 F. 2d 579 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 904 (1977).

[49]610 F.2d 1379 (5th Cir. 1980).

[50]656 F.2d 1337 (9th Cir. 1981).

[51]*Mothan v. Temple University*, 83 F.R.D. 368 (E.D. Pa. 1979).

[52]*Penk v. Oregon State Board of Education*, No. 80-436 (D. Oregon, Oct. 13, 1981) noted in Farley, 21.

[53]*Wilkins v. University of Houston* 654 F.2d 388 (5th Cir. 1981).

[54]*Cooper v. University of Texas at Dallas*, 482 F.Supp. 187(N.D. Texas 1979).

[55]*Keyes v. Lenoir Rhyne College*, 552 F.2d 579 (4th Cir. 1979).

[56]*Presseisen v. Swarthmore College*, 71 F.R.D. 34 (E.D.Pa. 1976).

[57]*Lamphere v. Brown University*, 71 F.R.D. 641 (D.R.I. 1976).

[58]*Mecklenberg v. Montana State Board of Regents of Higher Education*, 13 E.P.D. ¶ 11,438 (D. Mont. 1976).

[59]*Ibid.*

[60]Farley, 12.

[61]*Ibid.*

[62]71 F.R.D. 641 (D.R.I. 1976).

[63]Farley, 54-55, 91. *See also Lamphere v. Brown University* (In re Woods), 491 F.Supp. 232 (D.R.I. 1980).

[64]Farley, 12.

[65]*Ibid.*, 91-92.

[66]*See, Rajender v. University of Minnesota*, 20 E.P.D. 30,225 (D.Minn. 1979).

[67]William J. Broad, "Ending Sex Discrimination in Academia," *Science*, Vol. CCVIII, No. 6 (June 1980), 1120-22.

[68]Farley, 20.

[69]*Ibid.*, 91-92.

[70]*Hill v. Nettleton*, 455 F.Supp. 514(D.Colo. 1978).

[71]See, e.g., *Mecklenburg v. Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education*, 13 E.P.D. ¶ 11,438 (D.Mont. 1976).

[72]*See, e.g., Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Tufts Institute*, 421 F.Supp. 152 (D.Mass. 1975).

[73]621 F.2d 532(3d Cir. 1980).

[74]*Ibid.*, 535. *Kunda v. Muhlenberg College*, 463 F. Supp. 294 (E.D.Pa. 1978).

[75]Farley, 17.

BENT IS A FOUR-LETTER WORD

Jeffrey Huberman

Indiana-Purdue University at Fort Wayne (IPFW) is a combined regional campus for both Indiana University and Purdue University in the northeast Indiana city of Fort Wayne, population 190,000. The Theatre Department at the University is part of the Purdue operation. It produces plays under the name of Purdue-Indiana Theatre--known to the theatregoing public as PIT. For the last sixteen years PIT has been a very popular institution in Fort Wayne, producing thought-provoking dramas that might not be seen at the city's community and dinner theatres. Twice, in 1973 and 1976, PIT took plays to the Kennedy Center as finalists in the American College Theatre Festival.

As the newly elected chairman of the Theatre Department in July 1981, I faced the task of presiding at a meeting held to select plays for our fall season. When the faculty approved Larry Life's request to direct Martin Sherman's play, *Bent*, in the November/December slot, none of us could have predicted the controversy we were to endure.

By the time *Bent* closed on December 5, 1981, the cast of characters in the controversy included not only the Theatre Department staff and students, but also the county prosecutor, the chief of police of Fort Wayne, the vice squad, a local radio station owner, and the lead guitarist of a new-wave rock band. What follows is the account of this controversy.

Bent deals graphically with the little-known Nazi extermination in concentration camps of two million homosexuals during World War II. The play focuses on two homosexual inmates of Dachau and their heroic attempts not to be dehumanized by the Nazis.

From a chairman's viewpoint, the play could easily stir up administrative as well as popular controversy. First, there is the fact that Sherman's homosexual protagonists are drawn sympathetically and heroically--a circumstance likely to cause homophobic reactions in narrow-minded people. Second, some of the dialogue in the play is explicitly sexual; in one scene the two lovers bring each other to sexual climax merely by talking themselves through oral intercourse. Third, there is a two-and-one-half-second scene in the play in which one of the characters walks across the stage nude.

Still, I agreed with the theatre faculty that, considering PIT's history of producing potentially controversial plays, *Bent* should not be a significant problem. In the last ten years the department had produced other plays that seriously and sympathetically deal with homosexuality: *The Boys In The Band*, *The Killing of Sister George*, and *Children's Hour*. Adult language had never been a problem in any PIT production, and as far as nudity was concerned, the department's last production to appear at the Kennedy Center as an ACTF finalist was *Hair* in 1976--a musical in which nudity is a central effect.

However, proceeding with caution and prudence so that we might publicly legitimize the production as well as let the public know what it would encounter with the play, certain precautionary steps were taken as part of the pre-show publicity campaign. For instance, all advertising, releases, and official announcements stated, "This play realistically depicts the Nazi persecution of homosexuals in concentration camps during World War II. Parental discreation is advised." In addition, patrons who called for reservations or picked up tickets at the box office also were told that the play contained some nudity as well as adult language.

The week before the show opened, the Theatre Department sponsored a heavily attended "Open Forum on *Bent*" that was advertised as a scholarly discussion of the "history and contemporary implications of the Nazi extermination of homosexuals during World War II." Serving as moderator, the panel included the director, Larry Life, as well as a psychology professor, a history professor, a native German professor, a respected editor of a state-wide newspaper, a rabbi, and a priest. Some of these panelists also wrote essays on the play that were included in the production playbill.

In general, the Theatre Department tried to promote the idea that *Bent* was not, in fact a "gay" play, but a play about the triumph of the human spirit in the midst of the most degrading and debilitating circumstances. In spite of--or perhaps because of--these various attempts to legitimize out production of *Bent*, the play was not to open without significant cause for alarm.

By the morning of our opening night, November 20, the entire run of eight performances was sold out, and there was a waiting list of twenty to forty people for each performance. That afternoon, in the midst of the pre-show preparations, we received a phone call from the campus police chief. He told us that Orville Roberts, the captain of the Fort Wayne Vice Squad, had called to inform him that thirteen official citizens'

complaints had been filed against *Bent* as being obscene and in violation of city and state nudity statutes. Roberts said that Vice Squad officers would probably attend the opening night, and if the city's laws were violated they would make arrests.

Some frantic research at the library unearthed the relevant city laws. The City of Fort Wayne Code of Laws declares that *It shall be unlawful for any person to perform any indecent, immoral, or lewd play or representation within the corporate limits of the city.* Those acts specifically prohibited from dramatic representation include: *Acts of masturbation, excretory functions, lewd exhibition of the genitals, sadomasochistic abuse, homosexuality, lesbianism, bestiality, sexual intercourse or physical contact with a person's clothed or unclothed genitals, pubic area, buttocks, or the breast or breasts of a female for the purpose of sexual stimulation, gratification or perversion.*

As far as liability was concerned, the Code indicated that the cast as well as the theatre faculty would be subject to criminal prosecution: *Every person who knowingly engages or participates in, manages, produces, sponsors, presents, or exhibits any obscene performance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.*

As applicable to *Bent* as this ordinance sounds, a quick call to a local judge and an Indiana Civil Liberties Union lawyer convinced us that the latest Supreme Court ruling on obscene performances protected us from prosecution. In Miller vs. California (1972) the Burger Court ruled that a matter or a performance is obscene only if it fulfills all of the following three criteria: 1.) The average person, applying contemporary community standards, finds the dominant theme of the matter or performance, taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest in sex. 2.) The matter or performance depicts or describes, in a patently offensive way, sexual conduct. 3.) The matter of performance, taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value. While arguments could be made that *Bent* was not in violation of the first two criteria, it certainly is a work of serious literary, artistic, and political value. Therefore, we were reasonably assured that we could not be arrested on obscenity charges.

Nudity, however, was another matter altogether. The Public Indeceny Statute of the Indiana State Code states that a person commits a Class A misdemeanor if *a person knowingly or intentionally, in a public place appears in a state of nudity; . . .'Nudity' means the showing of the human male or female genitals, pubic area, or buttocks with less than a fully opaque covering, the showing of the female breast with less than a fully opaque covering of any part of the nipple, or the showing of the covered male genitals in a descernibly turgid state,* Even though the law appears to be of questionable constitutionality--"nudity in a public place" is broad enough to apply to taking a shower at the YMCA--it has in fact been upheld by the Indiana Supreme Court as recently as 1979. There was no doubt about it. The two-and-a-half-second nude scene in *Bent* was in violation of Indiana law.

At a quickly arranged faculty meeting it was decided not to put the undergraduate actor who was to do the scene in the position of possibly being arrested. If the Vice Squad officers attended, he would wear a towel in the scene.

In the midst of our search through the prop room for a towel, however, we received a call from the Vice Squad Captain himself, Orville Roberts. He served to allay most of our concerns. He told us that since none of the thirteen complaints had been filed by anyone who had seen the play, he was legally unable to act on them. In any event, he informed us that, because of the sold-out houses, he was unable to obtain any tickets for his officers. Finally, he assured us that if he received a complaint from someone who had attended a performance, he would call us in advance of sending any officers. The case was closed as far as I was concerned, and the towel stayed in the prop room.

Bent opened without incident to an enthusiastic SRO audience. It received rave reviews from the two Fort Wayne dailies, *The Journal-Gazette* and *The News-Sentinel* as well as from the student newspaper, *The Communicator*. Members of the university's administration also were in attendance on opening night. They were assured of the play's legality and were impressed with Life's outstanding production. The decision was made that night to add four additional performances, all of which sold out within twenty-four hours without benefit of advertising. We had a big hit, and we were confident of having an exciting, if uneventful, run. Four two weeks this was the case.

At the start of the third and final week of performances, the death threats arrived. The first threats came in the form of two ominous telephone calls to director Larry Life. The first caller said that if Life cared about his safety, the performances of *Bent* must stop. The second caller said that if Life went home that night, he would be sorry. Another group of threats was directed at one of the student cast members, who received letters threatening his life. In all he received four letters--all typewritten, all unsigned, and all particularly poronographic. The first letter said essentially that the writer knew where the actor lived and that he had seen him kiss a man on stage. The second said, "Be glad you lived through another day." The third said, "You die, fag!" The fourth said, "Don't worry, it's almost over." As if these were not enough, a vandal broke into the theatre after hours and painted a swastika on the stage floor.

The city police began an immediate investigation. Campus police provided extra plain-clothes officers to handle security for the rest of the performances. But as *The Journal-Gazette* pointed out in its December 3, 1981, editorial, "*Bent* and the Twisted," the real danger from the threats was far more subtle and symptomatic of the community as a whole: *There's something involved here beyond one or two cranks with sick attitudes. The issue is the community climate, the attitude supposedly decent people have toward a minority of citizens. The Nazis got away with murdering Jews because*

decent people harbored old prejudices, so they tolerated it. Racist politicians passed segregation laws because decent people shared their feelings. Homosexuals still face the loss of jobs, housing and credit because decent people will tolerate it. And the cranks and the emotionally disturbed get the idea that it's safe to act out their feelings, too.

Having dealt with all of these legal and illegal threats against the production, we were still not prepared for our coming encounter with local radio station owner and rock promoter, Art Templar. As the owner of the heavy metal rock radio station WXKE, Templar invited me to be a guest on his talk show, "Point Blank." He had seen *Bent*, he said, and wanted to give me a chance to respond publicly to all of the controversy about the homosexuality in the play. It seemed like a good opportunity to clear the air and establish with the public once and for all the legitimate theatrical intentions of Purdue-Indiana Theatre. So I accepted Templar's invitation. On Thursday morning, December 3 (with only three performance of *Bent* remaining), I arrived at WXKE accompanied by my dean. I soon discovered that Art Templar had personal and ulterior, rather than altruistic, reasons for inviting me to do his show.

The first surprise of the morning was that I was not the only guest that Templar had invited to do the show. Joining me was the Assistant Chief of Police, Dave Racine, who was there, Templar explained, to clarify the law as it applied to *Bent*.

The second, and even greater surprise occurred about thirty minutes into what appeared to be a standard series of questions about the play and its theme. Suddenly, without warning, Templar called into the broadcast studio two camera crews and reporters from both the CBS and ABC TV affiliates in town. To everyone's surprise, Templar then turned to the Assistant Police Chief and declared that he was publicly filing an official citizens complaint against the nude scene in PIT's production of *Bent*. He also demanded that the complaint be filed with Allen County prosecutor, Arnold Duemling, for immediate action, since the play was scheduled to close in three days.

Templar justified his on-the-air grandstanding as his attempt to deal with what he called the "double standards in this community." His specific gripe stemmed from the fact that some months ago Templar had promoted a rock concert at the Fort Wayne Memorial Coliseum by the new wave rock group AC-DC. Near the end of their concert, the group's lead guitarist had dropped his pants and "mooned" the mostly teenaged audience. At that point the Vice squad had moved in, closed the show, and barred the band from future Fort Wayne performances. From Templar's point of view, it constituted a double standard to permit nudity on the PIT stage in *Bent* and not in his rock concert.

While Templar may have had a point about "double standards," his true motives in making students and faculty of the University subject to criminal prosecution were seriously questioned by the listening audience and the media. One of his listeners wrote to *The Journal-Gazette* (12/10/81) to complain that Templar's indignation was misguided, that on the same day he filed his complaint his station broadcast a Rod Stewart song called "Foolish Behavior" that contained graphic lyrics." In a letter to the *Gazette* (12/22/81), Don Ray, the former program/operations director for a competing Fort Wayne radio station, also questioned Templar's motives by pointing out that the *Bent* "cause" as well as Templar's other media-grabbing causes always seem to occur during the audience ratings periods for radio stations. When the ratings periods were over, Templar's causes were never heard of again.

It was *The Journal-Gazette* itself, however, in its editorial of December 15, 1981, that best answered Templar on the question of who determines community standards: *Well, in this particular case, we would think the students and staff involved in the PIT production should determine what plays deserve their time and effort. If PIT were to consistently offend the standards of the community, the community would quit attending PIT productions. In that context, it's worth noting that Bent sold out for every performance. . . .let's hope Templar's misdirected crusade doesn't have a chilling effect on serious drama in Fort Wayne.*

The fact was, however, that the complaint (from someone who had seen the show) had been filed, and there was little prosecutor Duemling could do but follow it through by sending a vice officer to investigate *Bent's* nude scene. In addition, Duemling warned that if the investigation indicated that the scene violated the law, those persons involved with its production could be charged with criminal offenses, even though the play was no longer in production.

While we were searching the prop room again for that towel, we received another call from the police, this time from Police Chief Dave Riemen. He had called to tell us that a vice officer would attend the show Friday night (December 4). He said, however, that we should not worry about the visit since he had just conferred with Duemling, and they had both agreed that *Bent* was legitimate theatre protected under the Constitution. The nude scene, in their opinion, did not need to be covered up.

Taking him at his word, we produced the play as usual on Friday. Before the house opened, a plain-clothes vice officer arrived, introduced himself to the director and to me, and was given a good, complimentary seat. After the performance, he waited until the audience had left to tell us how "powerful" and "moving" he had found the play, statements he later included in his report to the prosecutor. He also told Duemling that in his opinion the dialogue would not make sense if the nude scene was removed. Despite the officer's encouraging statements, the nude scene still violated, on the surface, the state's anti-nudity law. But, we reasoned, the prosecutor--through the police chief--had given us his word.

In order to solve the dilemma of the law versus his word, Duemling used the anti-obscenity law (of which we were obviously not in violation) to overrule the nudity statute (of which we were in violation).

Five days after *Bent* had closed, Duemling ruled against Templar's complaint in the following manner: He pointed out that the nude scene was written into the play by the author, and it was not added by the local producers for their own purposes. Furthermore, he stated that his decision not to prosecute was based on an Indiana statute defining obscenity according to the three criteria set down by the US Supreme Court (as mentioned earlier), "Taken as a whole," ruled Duemling, "I find the play is not obscene."

In a December 15, 1981, editorial titled "*Bent*--Reason Prevails," *The Journal-Gazette* summed up the general relief felt by everyone except Templar at Duemling's ruling: *Allen County Prosecutor Arnold Duemling has provided a reasonable interpretation of an unreasonable law, and so those involved in Purdue-Indiana Theatre's production of Bent don't have to worry about criminal prosecution for a controversial two-and-a-half-second nude scene in the play. . . .Art Templar, general manager of WXKE-FM, had attempted to make a point about the uneven enforcement of the state's public indecency law. But even as vague as the state law is, the scene in question was clearly exempt under provisions excluding works of redeeming social or literary merit from prosecution. Fortunately Duemling--and the police officer sent to watch a performance of the controversail play--recognized this, and decided not to pursue the matter any further.*

Templar, incidentally, had vowed that if he lost, he would take his complaint to the state's attorney general. As of this writing, he has not done so.

It has been many months now since *Bent* closed, and with the reason of distance, certain questions might well be asked. For instance, should we all be relieved and encouraged by the fact that justice and freedom of expression were upheld in the case of IPFW's production of *Bent*? Has not reason prevailed, as *The Journal-Gazette* pointed out? From where I sit as Chair of the Theatre Department I would have to say, "Not really."

The anti-obscenity and the anti-nudity laws are still on the books in Indiana. They were not, in the end, used against us, because Allen County has a progressive prosecutor and Fort Wayne has a tolerant police chief, one theatrically sensitive vice officer, and a daily newspaper that supports artistic and academic freedom. In another place, with other officials or a more hostile press, these same laws could be used as repressive tools of censorship and persecution.

Finally, what was it that really caused this city-wide controversy over a university production of *Bent*? In my opinion the primary cause was the fact that Sherman's play is one of the first commercially successful dramas to portray homosexuals as heroic, and their love for each other as triumphant. Nudity and adult language are not really theatrical issues in academia anymore. A university theatre department cannot really be accused of trying to teach students nudity or nudism by including it in one of its productions. But a teacher, a department, and a university can be accused of teaching, condoning, and approving of homosexuality by producing a play such as *Bent*. Homophobia was at the center of the University's *Bent* controversy.

In the midst of all the sensational publicity last December, it was *The Journal-Gazette* in its editorial, "*Bent* and the Twisted" that reminded all of us in Fort Wayne about true literary and artistic responsibility: *So it takes the playwrights and the poets and the novelists to remind us, repeatedly of our common humanity, of the terrible fact that when we cause pain and suffering to Jews and blacks and homosexuals that we also hurt ourselves. The writers peel away the abstractions and the stereotypes and show us the human faces with their joy and tears that mirror each of us. Roots did that. And Holocaust. And now, in Fort Wayne, Bent. Sadly, the lesson in long overdue.*

For those of us in the Theatre Department at Indiana-Purdue University at Fort Wayne it was a lesson well learned about our community.

CLOSING THE BUDGETARY GAP: BUILDING SUBSCRIPTION AUDIENCES BY DESIGN

William V. Patterson

Long before Baumol and Bowen's prophetic labelling of the "economic dilemma" of the performing arts sixteen years ago, producers of non-profit theatre fought rising inflation.[1] Both the buyer and the seller of the arts are suffering the harsh economic realities of the marketplace as expenses rise more rapidly than income.

As part of instructional programs, educational institutions generally subsidize campus theatres through support of faculty and staff, physical facilities, utilities and maintenance. In return for institutional subsidy, campus theatre provide a living laboratory for future performers, directors, designers and managers. In addition, educational theatres are a cultural resource as well as an intellectual stimulus for both the campus and the surrounding community. The educational benefits are obvious; properly exploited, the service to the neighboring community can be an important asset to the institution's public image.

As documented by a nationwide survey in 1980, Americans and the Arts, *there is a growing groundswell of sentiment among the general public that the arts are a vital part of the American experience. In fact, large numbers of men and women indicate disappointment that arts opportunities are not more readily available.*[2] More importantly the same survey bears the encouragings news that *22 percent of the sample went to live theatre performances two or three times in the last year. In the 1975 survey, that number was 15 percent.*[3]

The opinion poll also provided respondents the opportunity to register reasons for not attending more performances. Some of these reasons were that "ticket prices are too high," performances are "too difficult to get to," patrons have "difficulty in finding a parking place" and performances are "given in questionable neighborhoods."[4]

Campus theatres can help to insure their financial survival by meeting the public's desire for "available" arts and by finding solutions for the problems raised as deterrents to attendance. In other words, campus theatres must heighten their visibility, improve their image, and build their audiences--the ticket-buying contributors--to self-supporting income. Greater emphasis must, therefore, be placed upon the creative promotional activities necessary to maximize earned income. As Baumol and Bowen concluded in the mid-sixties, ". . . the economic pressures which beset the arts are not temporary--they are chronic."[5] Educational theatres cannot ignore the growing necessity for aggressive campaigns to build audiences.

This study of season subscription practices at the University of Maryland in College Park, stressing the importance of a dynamic subscription sales campaign, will include both general and specific suggestions for strengthening campus theatre promotional practices.

The Season Subscription Campaign

During the 1974-75 season, prior to aggressive subscription campaigns, the University Theatre at the University of Maryland had 980 subscribers. Seven years later, the University Theatre showed 4,120 total subscribers, a 420% increase over six seasons.

The Economics of Season Subscriptions

The season subscription at the University of Maryland is priced to sell. Individual ticket prices are scaled only upon the qualifications of the buyer. Faculty and staff receive discounts only upon subscriptions. Undergraduates receive the lowest ticket price in return for a subsidy from student activity fees. There are separate single ticket prices for musicals and for non-musicals:

	Musical	Non-Musical
Standard Admission	$6.00	$5.00
Senior citizens, all students including children, groups	$5.00	$4.00
Undergraduates	$4.00	$3.00

The subscription discount ranges from 15% to 45%, depending upon the day of performance and the qualifications of the buyer. The general public saves 30% by subscribing on Thursday evening or Sunday afternoon. Senior citizens, faculty and staff, children and students other than University of Maryland undergraduates save 30% by subscribing on Friday or Saturday evening; this same group saves 45% by subscribing on Thursday evening or Sunday afternoon. The sizeable discounts are a major selling factor.

We offer the greatest discount for slower-selling performances on Thursday evenings and Sunday afternoons. As the subscription audience grows, we will gradually continue to reduce the percentage of the discount in each category. However, at this

point in building the audience, even the 55% income from the sale of the lowest-priced subscription equals slightly more than the income that would be realized if that individual purchased single tickets to only two productions. Given the whims of the single ticket buyer, he or she might only come to the musical and would then only buy one ticket. With that in mind, we have made money--even at the 45% discount.

Planning the Season's Promotion and Launching the Subscription Sales Campaign

The very first element of the seasons's promotion is to establish a complete plan, a total calendar of promotional activities and deadlines, for both the subscription sales campaign, and the publicity for each individual production. Experience should guide the theatre in developing a basic pattern of activities required to promote both a season and each single play within that season. A good basic pattern should probably include an overlapping sequence of brochure and flyer mailings, news releases, public service announcements, paid advertising, and other promotional elements.

Each step of every project should be scheduled. A deadline calendar keeps the promotional staff looking ahead, anticipating work flow and, most importantly, meeting deadlines. The staff will find itself working usually two to three months ahead of each production.

The sale of the new season should be launched with an advertisement in the program for the final production of the previous season. This announcement will alert current subscribers to watch for the opportunity to renew their subscriptions by mail; it also will add names of potential subscribers to the mailing list. The quality of the final production of the current season and the prospective titles for the upcoming season should excite both old and new subscribers about the entertainment values of the coming year. It is best to list firm titles for the coming year, but a reasonable list of "plays under consideration" is acceptable.

Renewing Current Subscribers

The subscriptions sold most easily are those to the renewing current subscribers. Ideally, they are pleased with the concluding season, excited about the prospects of the year to come and willing to re-subscribe. Early renewal of these subscribers gives the campus theatre two chief benefits: (1) the box office staff can process these orders early, before general public sales begin, and (2) the theatre earns income with which to begin purchasing production materials for the coming year.

Mailings of renewal flyers should begin shortly after the opening of the final production of the current season. Current subscribers will have the theatre on their minds: either they have attended the final production and have seen the program advertisement of the coming season, or they are anticipaing seeing the final production soon.

The costs of mailing pieces for renewals are minimal. The recipient of renewal notices is predisposed to buy the offered subscription; in most cases, colored ink and expensive stock are not necessary to impress this buyer. The urgency and immediacy associated with a simple typewritten renewal flyer is effective. A rubber-stamped message (such as "SUBSCRIBERS--renew your seats now for next season!") in red ink on the address panel adds to the sense of urgency. Of course, those who do not renew at once are retained on a mailing list labeled "non-renewed subscribers" and are given repeated opportunities to be persuaded.

A second copy of the renewal flyer should be mailed three weeks later, and a third copy two weeks after that. At the University of Maryland we renew approximately 35% of our current subscribers with the first flyer, another 25% of the total with the second flyer, and a final 20% with the third flyer. The third flyer is rubber-stamped with the warning: "LAST CHANCE TO RENEW SUBSCRIPTIONS before seats are released to new subscribers!." By the June 1 deadline for subscribers to renew their same seats, approximately 80% of them are committed to the coming year.

A telephone campaign can be an effective reinforcement for the direct mail. The first mailing of the renewal flyer will bring in the most renewals in about three weeks. The day the second flyer is mailed, the telephone reminders should begin. A telephone canvasser should make three attempts, on three different evenings, to reach each non-renewed subscriber. The attempted calls should be logged on a simple form that lists the name, telephone number, and dates of each attempted call.

If the subscriber indicates he or she will not renew, the reason for the decision should be noted.

Naturally the person making the telephone calls should have a pleasant telephone personality and be well-versed in the details of the subscription system, the plays for the coming season, and the benefits of subscribing. To secure the right person for this job, the theatre manager may wish to negotiate a motivational fee that is a combination of a minimum wage and a commission for each subscription order received. We have used this system once at the University of Maryland, as part of the renewal effort for the current season. Labor and commission costs totalled $350.00 for about fifty hours of work. The majority of the subscribers telephoned appreciated the reminder and promptly sent in their orders. Our telephone campaign produced 500 subscription orders at a gross of $7,500.00. Without the telephone campaign there would not be a total renewal rate of 90% for 1982-83.

Recovering Lapsed Subscribers

The next least expensive sale (after that to renewing subscribers) is to previous subscribers who have allowed their subscriptions to lapse for one or more seasons. We have had success in sending lapsed subscribers a form letter saying "we missed you last year" and a copy of the regular renewal flyer which has been rubber-stamped "RE-JOIN AS A SUBSCRIBER before general public mailings."

One way to lessen the number of lapsed subscribers and to insure more automatic renewals is to use a subscription system based on "seat ownership." As practiced by

many arts organizations and sports groups, this plan allows subscribers to renew exactly the same "good" seats each season. If the subscriber does not renew the seats by a certain deadline, the seats are made available, first to renewing subscribers who wish to better their seating locations, and then to the general public. With this plan, subscribers with only a marginal interest in the plays for the coming season may well re-subscribe simply to retain their good seats, hoping that the plays will look better the following season.

The Subscription Brochure

The season brochure is the central instrument of the sales campaign. It is the major tool to recruit new subscribers and the back-up tool to bring in lagging non-renewed subscribers from previous seasons. A survey of the University of Maryland theatre audience by R. Patrick Williams in 1978 indicates the importance of the subscription brochure:

. . . 51.5% of the University Theatre audience has seen the mail brochure and . . . the brochure influenced the ticket purchase of 34.0% of the respondents. [6]

Oddly, a study by Terri C. Eakin, "An Exploratory Study of Public Relations in the Educational Theatre," found that campus theatres are reluctant to depend upon direct mail. In a national survey of 170 educational theatres, only 18% felt that direct mail was the most effective publicity/public relations tool for reaching the community audience, although 88% responded that they made use of direct mail.[7] But direct mail, with postage at non-profit bulk rates, is the most economical means of making a sale. The direct mail brochure or flyer can contain more complete details than a newspaper advertisement or a poster. The piece of direct mail places complete information directly in the hands of a selected potential buyer. Carefully chosen mailing lists provide the campus theatre with a much more direct exposure to interested buyers than expensive, non-selective display advertising in newspapers and magazines.

The Design and Layout of the Subscription Brochure

Bradley G. Morison and Kay Fliehr, who helped to establish the audience development plans for the opening of the Tyrone Guthrie Theatre, write strongly of the impact of an institution's printed image: *Graphics and words have a great effect upon the image which the public receives about an organization. A theatre must rely heavily on display and printed material and can suffer untold damage to its image--and its profits--by an unwise choice of words and/or graphics.*[8]

Morison and Fliehr describe the illusive concept of image as: *the total impression which an individual has of an organization--the synthesis of everything he has read, heard, seen, or personally experienced. . . . Strangely enough, this total impression or 'image'--accurate or inaccurate, rationally or irrationally created--has more influence upon an individual's actions than any other factor, including the most logical sales argument. Image, then, becomes of overriding importance in the creation and operation of any organization or institution.*[9]

Subscription brochures at the University of Maryland use a strong graphic appeal to arrest the attention of the recipient. The ink colors are bold; the stock is coated, creating a shiny, reflective surface. The brochures have the polished look of quality.

In designing a subscription brochure, it is best to avoid pale, weak colors, drab and lifeless colors, or extreme, unreadable colors. Strong stable colors that make a vivid impression about the organization are best. If using two colors, the first color should be dark enough to carry the text type strongly. The brighter and lighter second color is used primarily for emphasis, whether for coloring background panels or for backgrounds and bold headline type. In screening inks, it is a good idea to check samples of the screens to be certain that the impact of a good bold color, once screened, does not become pale and weak. If the piece is to carry photographs of people, cool ink colors should be avoided: blue and green fleshtones are not appealing.

Typestyles should be chosen in much the same way as colors. The dynamic qualities of exciting, live theatre receive emphasis with bold, legible type. Highly decorative display typestyles are generally less legible and less effective than type with more recognizable characters. The use of too many different styles and sizes should be avoided, for readers who must visually re-orient themselves to too many new styles or sizes may become weary of trying to discover the message. Text type that provides distinct, readable copy in harmony with the decorative display typestyle is best.

Should the brochure include artwork depicting each production of the season? Probably not, because from its very first appearance in advertising materials, until its appearance on the cover of the performance program, the artwork for a production should be a visual representation of the major concepts behind that particular production. The development of such finely-tuned artwork takes considerable time. For this reason and because of potential layout problems of creating visual conflicts among the season's various productions--we recommend designing the subscription brochure with its own distinctive graphic appeal and postponing the artwork for each individual show until its own mail order flyer, poster, advertisements, and program are published.

The brochure should be a manageable size; a cumbersome poster/brochure is virtually impossible to open, read, and absorb while leisurely reading the days mail. A booklet style brochure adds to printing costs because saddle-stitched binding is more expensive than a folded brochure, and there is a chance that recipients will stop reading before they get to the end of the booklet. We prefer a folded brochure that easily divides itself by folds and color changes, into logical and convenient sections that indicate what to read and in what order.

The Outside of the Brochure

Experience has shown that most people open self-mailing pieces from the side on which their addresses appear. Therefore,

arrange the inside of the brochure to allow logical opening and reading of the brochure starting from that side. But do allow for the fact that 50% of the recipients may take the brochure from their mailbox with the opposite side facing them; thus, make good use of both sides of the folded brochure: on the front and on the back tell the recipients what is wanted of them--to subscribe now!

The address panel features the theatre logo, return address and postal indicia, and the basic promotional message--subscribe now and save. Key words, such as "bargain," "save," "free," and "affordable," urge the recipient to open the brochure to explore the discount. The discount itself is stated three different ways: saving a good percentage sounds good to some readers, seeing something for free sounds better to others, and saving a good amount of money sounds best to many.

The brochure cover also should include a carefully worded disclaimer to excuse duplicate mailings, urging the recipient to pass along extra brochures with a personal endorsement. In Williams's survey of audiences in 1978, *"a majority of the respondents who were attending a University Theatre production for their first season had purchased a ticket because of the advice of a friend. Word-of-mouth advertising plays the biggest role in getting people to attend the theatre for the first time. The mail brochure ranked second in influencing the respondents who were attending their first season."*[10]

The Inside of the Brochure

For building the excitement and reasons for subscribing, a strong color contrast between the address panel and the first inside panels is good. Again, the copy repeats the central theme of exciting, affordable theatre and describes the benefits that subscribers enjoy: the savings, convenience and sense of privilege in being a subscriber. Without exaggeration the benefits of subscribing should be described in the best terms available.

Fully opened, the brochure should move the recipient graphically from one section to the next, from the titles of the season's productions, to the ordering details, to the order blank. Fully opened, the color changes of the brochure should draw the reader to the order blank. An order blank with a white or light background is magnetic; its lightness makes it seem inviting and simple to complete.

In presenting the plays of the season, authorship credits, and a brief description of each play, the copy should feature carefully chosen words to build the reader's sense of excitement, expectation, and respect for the works. It is best to describe all plays; it is unwise to assume that the audience will know even the most famous works. Although strong, positive copy is needed, offensive overselling should be avoided.

The details for ordering subscriptions should bear a purposefully worded heading such as "It's Easy to Subscribe." It is important to spell out all terms of subscribing (the pricing, the performance dates, the fine print, etc.) but it helps to condition the readers' acceptance by reassuring them that the details are easy to follow. As a service to the theatre's audience and to other campus organizations in the arts, this section also could contain a directory of campus arts telephone numbers.

The Order Blank

The placement of the order blank within the whole brochure is most important. First, the order blank should appear near the end of the recipient's exploration of the brochure. Many subscription brochures work against this most basic principle of salesmanship by placing the order blank awkwardly inside the front cover before the buyer has been convinced of the benefits of the season offered.

Second, the brochure should be designed so that the address panel is mailed back to the theatre by printing the order blank and the address panel back-to-back. Each returned order form can thus be checked to determine the mailing list that produced the sale. This research will pay huge dividends by showing which lists to use more heavily and which lists to discard in future campaigns.

The order blank should include a motivational heading: "Order your subscription today and save!" The top portion of the order blank will request basic information such as name, address, and telephone number. Subscribers should be provided with adequate space to fill in the blanks; buyers ought not meet frustration when they are ready to sign on the dotted line.

Because this brochure is intended primarily for new subscribers, it is important to indicate that many seats are already sold to renewing subscribers. A seating chart marked with the areas "sold out to renewing subscribers" can show the successful level of subscription renewals and give new subscribers the chance to make their own choice from the seating areas still available.

A carefully designed order blank reduces the chance for errors by requiring the subscriber to enter very little information. In this regard, it is best to provide a line on which to total the cost of subscri ordered and instructions for writing the check.

Mailing the Subscription Brochure

The Postal Service assigns no high priority to the delivery of third-class bulk-rate mail. As a consequence, it is virtually impossible for the bulk-rate mailer to predict delivery dates. Mail generally gets more attention from the recipient early in the week.

The necessity for maintaining accurate in-house mailing lists is obvious: inaccurate addresses waste printing and postage. As much as 25% of a mailing list can change in one year. For this reason, on every third or fourth mailing, it is advisable to take advantage of the "address correction requested" option offered by the Postal Service. It may be helpful to consider periodic mailings of a double postcard asking the general mailing list members, other than subscribers, if they wish to remain on the list. The notion of maintaining clean lists is not to contradict the principle of duplicate mailings. Duplicate mailings, on delivery dates, can be most effective in

moving the recipient to take action. Mail dates should be staggered so that duplicate brochures will be delivered to the same household at different times, ideally one to three weeks apart. Most businesses employ this basic principle of repeated advertising no matter what the medium, for the advertiser must assume that each message will arrive at the wrong time for some portion of the audience.

In scheduling mailings, concentrate on the two months at the close of the current season and the two months prior to the beginning of the next season. July is noted as the month with the lowest return per mailing, so schedule renewals from mid-April to mid-May, the first subscription brochure mailings in June, no mailings in July, and further subscription brochure mailings in August and September. The mail order flyer for individual tickets to the first production, which opens in October, also carries a reminder that discount subscriptions to the entire season are still available.

It is wise to use the theatre's house lists, both for non-renewed subscribers and the general mailing list, for repeated mailings at staggered intervals during the subscription period as part of the duplicate mailing principle.

What are other list posibilities? Lists can be traded or rented from local arts organizations, but theatre managers should remember that a theatre's list will be more valuable than an art gallery's list. Among theatre lists, another college's list will be more valuable than the local professional booking house. When using any of these lists, and certainly when using commercial "resident" lists, zip code areas should be carefully selected. By examining the subscriber lists, it is possible to discover the zip codes from which most subscribers come. These are obviously areas an appropriate distance from the theatre, areas where the population is generally of an appropriate income and educational level to be interested in the performing arts. It may therefore be wise to limit the use of other lists to these same zip codes. Would the alumni organization share a mailing list for active local alumni? If an alumnus is interested in active alumni club membership, he may be interested in campus activities. A distribution to the faculty and staff via free campus mail services is helpful. Labels addressed to the faculty and staff on campus should help to insure distribution to individual mailboxes within the departments. The use of impersonal commercial "resident" lists should not be overlooked. Mailing houses can provide sophisticated breakdowns of zip codes to allow the selection of only homeowners (as opposed to more transient renters) and different income levels (most surveys show arts audiences to have at least middle incomes). At Maryland we use the "resident" list as part of the campaign wrap-up, since this mailing will reach many of the people first approached from the theatre's own lists and from those of other arts organizations.

Student Subscriptions

Until student subscriptions were introduced three years ago at the University of Maryland, students had purchased only discounted tickets to individual productions. As the economy grew tighter, it was logical to apply the same appeal for subscriptions to the student audience. Few University of Maryland students live on campus, and most select their entertainment from the events in the metropolitan Washington area. The average student audience for any one campus production might equal only 20-25% of the total attendance. In order to capitalize on the student audience who seemed to attend most productions and to increase the participation of students who attended some but not all productions, we instituted the student subscription plan.

This subscription operation gives student subscribers a punch-card to present to the box office, starting one day before public sales begin for each production, so that they may choose a performance date and seating location. The subscription plan offers students a 30% savings over single student tickets to the four productions.

A special student subscription brochure is prepared for campus distribution to new students during summer orientation sessions, to dormitory residents, to students enrolled in dramatic literature courses in the English Department, and to students in non-major theatre courses. Printed in the same bold colors as the regular subscription brochure, the student piece is designed to save costs by lifting a good deal of artwork and type from the regular brochure. With one additional trim, the inside of the brochure becomes a campus poster. This same artwork and type also are reproduced in advertisements in the campus newspaper during the first few days of fall classes. The repetition of the graphic image thus reinforces both the regular brochure and the student brochure.

The Expense of the Campaign and the Expected Results

Many expenses of the season campaign can be covered under general operating costs. The layout of the subscription brochure can be the duty of a staff graphic artist; the processing of orders can be the duty of the staff box office manager. Student workers hired from the revenue of a 50 cent service charge on each subscription can assist the box office manager.

All brochures should be printed on a competitive bid basis. Even with the low-bid printer, quality work should be required. As Morison and Fliehr emphasize, graphics and words play a major role in establishing a theatre's image, and this image must not be tarnished with anything less than quality printing.

The approximate out-of pocket costs for the 1982-83 season subscription campaign at the University of Maryland were:

Renewal Flyer Printing	$ 300.00
Subscription Brochure Printing	3,000.00
Student Subs. Brochure Printing	750.00
Bulk-Rate Postage, Renewal Flyer	150.00
Bulk-Rate Postage, Subs. Brochure	1,750.00
Telephone Labor and Commission	750.00
Mailing Services and Labor	1,300.00
Total Costs	$8,000.00

Based upon an average subscription price of $15.00, the subscription promotion costs are covered with the sale of 533 subscriptions.

In the 1974-75 season, before beginning aggressive season campaigns, the University of Maryland campus theatre sold 980 season subscriptions. Records do not survive to tell the story of the number of brochures printed and mailed or the costs involved. It appears, however, that materials were limited to a single brochure mailed one time only to previous subscribers and the general house list.

Analyzing the Results

In closing out the subscription sale, the theatre manager should carefully analyze the results of each mailing, check the address labels on the processed order blanks, and note the lists which drew well as well as those that did not. (Perhaps the weaker lists should be discontinued in subsequent seasons.)

The manager should check the daily tally of subscriptions sold against the previous season's sales pattern and should note the total number of subscriptions recorded from two days after each mailing until the next mailing date. As well, the theatre manager should chart the effect of using different lists at different times during the campaign, especially over a period of years. Are modifications in the mailing schedule suggested? He or she should check the number of subscribers from the previous season who have renewed for the coming year. How does this renewal figure compare with the past? If the figure is unusually high or low, are there logical explanations? Non-renewed former subscribers should be targeted for a follow-up letter that offers them a special ticket price to lure them back to see at least one production each season. As well, they might be asked, in this mailing, if they have reasons for non-renewal they would care to share. The manager will want to check the number of subscriptions sold in each category. How do the figures compare to the previous season? Do they suggest changes in the composition of the audience? Should there be changes in the discount structure or other sales devices? In other words, the theatre manager looks for every lesson that can be learned from the results of each season's campaign. There is always something to better in the coming year.

As the gap widens between income and expenses, educational theatres must increase their ability to earn income. Many campus theatres will have to cover the majority of rising production expenses with income earned from ticket sales. It is, therefore, prudent to start now to close the budgetary gap by building a strong, supportive subscription audience.

Endnotes

[1]William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen, *Performing Arts--The Economic Dilemma* (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1966), p. 1.

[2]*Americans and the Arts* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1981), p. 9.

[3]Carla Hall, "Greater Arts Support Reported in Poll," *The Washington Post*, 4 December 1980, p. C-1.

[4]*Americans*, p. 19.

[5]Baumol, p. 10.

[6]R. Patrick Williams, "The 1978 University Theatre Survey of Patrons and University Theatre Publicity 1975-1978" (M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1978), p. 84.

[7]Terri C. Eakin, "An Exploratory Study of Public Relations in the Educational Theatre" (M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1979), p. 71.

[8]Bradley G. Morison and Kay Fliehr, *In Search of an Audience: How an Audience Was Found for the Tyrone Guthrie Theatre* (New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1968), pp. 87-88.

[9]Morison, p. 62.

[10]Williams, p. 73.

SUMMER THEATRE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

D. Terry Williams

In 1973, the University of Northern Iowa experimented with a dinner theatre production of *Oliver!* presented in the Maucker Student Union for ten performances; 275 people took advantage of the dinner theatre package, and all ten performances sold out prior to opening. This success prompted the department to undertake for the next four summers three productions each summer performed in stock in the University Union with most performances preceded by dinner. Weeknight shows were dubbed "cabaret" and featured wine, soft drinks and snacks. Because the university theatre was the only dinner theatre in a metropolitan area of 125,000, the summer season met with success for all four years, playing to 83% capacity.

When the theatre program moved into its new facility, the Strayer-Wood Theatre in 1978, meals were continued in the lobby and adjacent art gallery for two summers; thereafter they were discontinued. It was clear that a successful dinner theatre depended on the meal and performance occurring in the same space. In addition, with a new 8 million dollar facility in which to produce plays, the department did not need to be in the restaurant business to attract audiences.

Several notes of advice are in order if the dinner theatre approach is used: (1) the meal and show should be in the same space; (2) a good caterer must be employed since most university food services are not equipped to deal with catered meals; (3) a liquor license and bar service is advantageous; (4) if the show is performed outside a regular theatre, the performing area should offer secure and adequate support spaces; (5) an effective format for an evening is a cocktail half-hour 6:30-7:00 p.m. prior to 7:00-7:30 buffet service, followed by an 8:00 curtain; (6) tables should be cleared by 7:45 except for beverage glasses and cups; and (7) one or two performances in a non-dinner theatre, or cabaret, setting can provide a less expensive ticket for students and other patrons.

Another matter of importance is the play selection. Serious drama is risky in dinner theatre. During the four years at Northern Iowa, primarily comedies and musicals were offered. However, the classics were not ignored: *School for Wives, The Imaginary Invalid, Taming of the Shew, Charlie's Aunt,* as well as *Dracula, Hay Fever, Harvey,* and traditional run of musicals, *Oklahoma, Jacques Brel, Guys and Dolls,* and *The Fantasticks* were performed.

Physically most dinner theatres offer extremely limited technical support spaces and staging flexibility and so are always a challenge to the designers and technical directors. Multiple set shows present almost insurmountable problems, however.

From 1978 to the present, the University of Northern Iowa has continued its summer repertory theatre. Audition notices are sent through-out the midwest in January. Announcements also are placed in several summer theatre directories. Every high school drama teacher in Iowa is alerted by poster and letter concerning summer theatre apprenticeships. High school juniors and seniors may receive college credit for summer repertory work. Apprentices are unsalaried and provide part of the running crews for the season. The number of apprentices usually ranged between eight and twelve.

Auditions for a core acting company of eight to ten actors are held in several places in March, for example, at the University and at the site of the Mid-America Theatre Conference. Video Tapes also are accepted. Occasionally, technicians and costume assistants have been hired from schools other than Northern Iowa. The faculty holds strongly to the concept of outside personnel comprising about one third of the summer company: not only is morale higher with the new blood, but also about one-half of the newcomers decide, during the eight week summer session, to transfer to the University because of their positive experiences.

Salaries are in the range of $100-$125 per week, from which each paid company member, with a few exceptions, pays approximately $100 for three hours tuition. On the average, sixy to seventy credit hours are generated each summer. There are two exceptions to the tuition requirement: volunteers from the community or faculty who play cameo and chorus roles or who work in the shops. Also, on several occasions actors can be hired only if they receive an honorarium.

Letters of agreement are drawn up and signed by the producing director and company member. These contractual letters are due by April 15. The full company forms the first Friday in June, with the technical and costume assistants beginning a week earlier.

Each of the three productions receives approximately thirty-five rehearsals, with three rehearsals a day but with Sunday morning and afternoon off. There are three rehearsal periods daily in three hour segments, resulting in about sixty hours of

rehearsal. The first show opens the last Thursday of June and re-opens the first weekend of July. The next two productions (of six performances each) occupy the other four July weekends. The season closes at the conclusion of the eight week summer session, about the first of August.

Show number one rehearses morning and evening, with the second production using the afternoon. Although the third show - the musical, does not formally begin rehearsals until the first show opens, short muscial sessions for the leading singers are squeezed in throughout June. Rarely are all thirty-five rehearsals used for the first two shows. Usually, the final week's morning and afternoon rehearsals are cancelled. The more difficult musicals usually need these times for technical rehearsals.

The plays selected from 1978 to the present combined the commercial with the educational, ranging from *Barefoot In the Park* and *Wait Until Dark* to *Twelfth Night*, *The Miser*, and *Cosi Fan Tutti*. Other productions included: *Ten Little Indians*, *Arms and the Man* (one of the least successful in terms of attendance), *The Miracle Worker*, *Bus Stop*, *Butterflies Are Free*, *Two for the Seesaw*, and the musical *Little Mary Sunshine*, *Anything Goes*, *Robber Bridegroom* and the two most well attended - *Grease* and *Pippin*. Attendance decreased from 83% during the dinner theatre days to 78% in the newer and larger 550 seat facility. It is clear that the smaller dinner theatre atmosphere guaranteed higher attendance, although less income.

Concerning budget, several ideas increased ticket sales or at least guaranteed the needed income to meet expenses. First, charging less for a weeknight performance with the higher priced ticket on weekends was very helpful. Second, a 15-20% discount for season subscribers provided an attfactive benefit. Third, a dollar more was charged for the musical, on the assumption that it is more expensive to mount and that patrons will more readily pay a higher price for it. Season subscribers have paid $11.00-$12.50 for weekend tickets; students and senior citizens paying $9.75. Single ticket prices ranged from $3.25 for a weeknight student/senior citizen to $5.50 for an adult weekend ticket to the musical. The budget for the 1982 summer repertory theatre program was based on income from six sources:

Box Office	$27,000
Advertising (programs)	1,000
Student Government	6,500
Student Services (general fund)	5,300
Instructional Monies	10,300
School of Music	2,000
Total	$52,100

Expenditures were:

Staff Salaries (as determined by collective bargaining contract and % of academic year base)	$18,150
Company salaries	15,200
Scenery, Props, Lights, Sound	5,200
Costumes & Makeup	3,100
Promotion	2,000
Tickets	350
Programs	$1,700
Orchestra	1,400
Royalties	2,000
Office	3,000
Total	$52,100

Staff salaries comprise the biggest portion of the budget. The staff consists of three directors, a designer/technical director, and a costume designer. The publicist and scene shop foreman are on twelve month contracts and therefore their salaries are not reflected in the budget. One of the directors serves as the administrative head of the program. The head, the costumer and the scene designer are paid full-time salaries. The other two directors are paid half-time salaries.

In addition to the student company of eight to ten core actors, there are usually three to five scene shop assistants, three costume assistants, an assistant director/stage manager, two box office people, a bookkeeper, and an assistant to the publicist - creating a total of ninteen to twenty-three student company members. (Apprentices and volunteer actors are not included in the budget).

The promotion of any summer season has a great deal to do with the competition as well as the specific bargain package offered. In the Waterloo - Cedar Falls area of Iowa our major competitor was the Waterloo Community Playhouse which runs a musical comedy most of the month of July. It was always assumed that (1) there was a large cross-over of patrons between the two summer operations and (2) their first and second choices among the total of four productions offered to the area in the six weeks would be the two musicals. Hence, most of the University promotional efforts went into the first two productions of the summer.

In addition to traditional avenues of publicity like public service spots, news and feature stories, publicity photos, and mailings, the theatre's community support group aided greatly to increase attendance. This group was formed simultaneously with the opening of the new building in 1978. It developed by-laws and formed a board of directors. In addition to awarding an annual full-tuition scholarship, giving gifts to the theatre (lobby furniture, plants, art work), and subsidizing visiting artists, the group sponsors opening-night receptions for the audience, cast, and crew. They also sponsor behind-the-scenes-looks and post-show discussions of the productions in the summer as well as throughout the year. Initiating the summer season with a picnic or lobby buffet, with each of the group members receiving a special invitation and encouragement to invite a guest, served to spread the word faster than if these people attended performances later in the run. The invaluable assistance given any theatre program - educational, community or commercial - by such a community support group cannot be overstressed.

Finally, the best advice for anyone trying to survive in the business of summer theatre is to know the audience. Then there is the dilemma: Do you give them what they need or what they want? Obviously, the more income received from sources other than box office, the more risks that can be afforded. Since 85% of Northern Iowa's summer patrons are "non-student," community people, we leaned more toward the commercial choices in terms of repertoire. The 1982 summer production of

Two for the Seesaw was the most serious entertainment endeavor to date, and played to 50%, the lowest attendance on record for the summer repertory program.

The picture seems fairly clear. Comedies and musicals, dinner and wine, receptions and picnics, discussions and theatre parties, all become an important part of the sales package in the competitive business of summer theatre. Although we would all like to think that well performed and adroitly directed productions should be enough to attract audiences, they are not. The "extras" are important, although they are time-consuming and cumbersome. But they have proved worth it at the University of Northern Iowa.

TOWARD A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY THEATRE PROGRAMS AND THE RESIDENT PROFESSIONAL THEATRE COMPANY

Lorayne W. Lester

Despite the fact that the partnership between professional resident theatre companies and American educational theatre programs now seems common, the liaison is a relatively new one. The idea grew out of efforts to "decentralize" American theatre in the 1950s when the Ford Foundation began awarding grants to a few professional theatre companies outside New York City. Its major growth, however, came in the sixties when federal funding for the arts, humanities, and education became national policy. The National Endowment for the Arts actively encouraged and supported the development of regional theatres, and, as regional professional theatres became more common, so too did the amalgamation of professional companies with college and university theatre programs. For example, the 1968 report, *Theatre in America: Appraisal and Challenge*, commissioned by the National Theatre Conference, described some dozen or so joint programs and urged the development of a national plan "to bring the professional theatre into closer collaboration with college and university programs."[1] While no such plan materialized, at least thirty-five colleges and universities throughout the country now support resident professional companies.

The motivation for such partnerships seems, at first glance, fairly simple and straightforward. Art students in all disciplines are generally thought to benefit from exposure to and training by professional artists, although the precise nature and degree of that benefit is still in some dispute. And, outside major urban areas, professional theatre companies are apt to find their most responsive and supportive audiences in college and university communities. For the resident company there is an added advantage, at least in some situations: because most universities large enough to consider on-campus professional theatre are to some degree state-supported, the resident company becomes a state-subsidized theatre. Its funds are channeled through regular university budgets, however, so that there is "a cultured and educated buffer" between the theatre and the state government that supports it, a not inconsequential matter.[2] As direct grants to non-profit regional theatres decline in the face of President Reagan's New Federalism and the worsening economy, some companies whose fortunes are tied up with those of a major university have a better chance of survival than those that must depend on chance beneficence or local audiences.

College and university administrators have traditionally been uneasy about arts education programs--quick to crow over accomplishments but uncertain about academic respectability. Their apprehension toward theatre programs has not been altogether ill-founded. Theatre faculties are still smarting from such attacks as Ruth Fischer's (*Change* magazine, 1974), which advocated the extinction of most college and university drama programs on grounds of their failure to produce students sufficiently trained for entry into the profession.[3] Less widely disseminated was Joseph Zeigler's charge that, with few exceptions, colleges and universities have *simply perpetuated ancient anti-professional prejudices and have produced graduates suited not for the profession but rather only for teaching other people to teach other people, ad infinitum.*[4] Such criticism has contributed to--in some instances literally created--real problems of academic respectability for theatre programs. The resident professional company, therefore, because it seems to give credibility to a curriculum, is not generally opposed by academic administrators. Moreover, it helps to provide high visibility--prized beyond compare by campus development officers--for some program other than the intercollegiate football team.

Nonetheless, there are still some serious questions to be answered about ultimate value, not only to students, but to host institutions as well. Indeed, there is some evidence that such questions have already been raised. Surprisingly little efforts has been made, however, to discover exactly what effect such liaisons have had on the academic units that house them, exactly how many of them exist, where they are, how they operate, how the resident company articulates with the curricular program, and many other questions on management, funding, facilities, staffing, and continuity. I hope that the new affiliation of ACA and the Chief Administrators Program of the University and College Theatre Association will encourage research in such areas. My own investigations are offered here because they exemplify certain problems other researchers will face, and they may serve to help them avoid some difficulties. The three general areas that I found troublesome were (1) determining the number of joint academic-professional programs, (2) determining ways of evaluating such programs, and (3) isolating those factors that administrators agreed were necessary for a successful liaison.

The Number of Joint Academic-Resident Professional Company Programs

For the sake of an economic and expedient early sample, I confined my initial inquiries to the states in the Southeastern Theatre Conference. My method was appallingly unscientific: telephone calls to campus administrators or to faculty friends with sworn assurances that sources would not be revealed. At the outset I knew that there were only three League of Resident Theatre (LORT)[5] companies affiliated with southeastern campuses: The Asolo State Theatre operated by Florida State University at Sarasota (which operates under a LORT "C" contract), the Playmakers Repertory Company at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (LORT "D"), and the Clarence Brown Company at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (a LORT "B" company). It became apparent very early, however, that even these companies were not comparable, since each operates within a unique, historical[ly] justified, administrative and political environment. Moreover, both Asolo and the Playmakers are long-term members of the University Resident Theatre Association, while the Clarence Brown Company's association with that organization has been incidental and occasional. Finally, for reasons unclear even to the University of Tennessee faculty, the Clarence Brown Company is not listed in the Theatre Communication Group's annual roster of regional professional companies.[6]

Discovering just how many university-affiliated resident professional companies exist is going to be a troublesome task if a good definition of "resident professional companies" is not found. It will be even more troublesome if no definition is found and the widely different definitions accepted by administrators are used.

Some administrators, for example, will insist that they have resident professional companies because they job in professionals for an entire season of the university production program. A variety of other administrators will describe their programs as professional because they regularly host touring companies or have visiting artists who teach for periods from a few weeks to a few years. Some will call their departments professional without referring to a resident professional company, thus confusing an already confused issue (the word "professional" having taken on magical qualities of its own) because their staffs have mostly MFA's and are required to engage in off-campus professional work.

Clearly, for the benefit of students if of nobody else, a commonly accepted and unemotional definition is needed. One department head told me that he did not have a resident professional company but that his Provost was beguiled by the idea and so believed it.

We must distinguish between resident professional company and professional program. "Resident professional company" implies a faculty of a certain size, a staff with certain qualifications, certain levels of funding, a certain kind of production season, and certain equipment and facilities. "Professional program" implies something different (but something still different again from the six-person faculty at the small state college where productions are staged in the student center. These people will not like to give up the word "professional", especially if one of their number toured last summer with an Equity production and a graduate recently qualified for the International Alliance of Theatre Stage Employees. One can sympathize with them, but definition is needed.)

The Value of the Resident Professional Company

The question of the value of the resident professional company has been widely discussed and--in print, at least--has been praised in the most glowing of terms. There are some very worrisome problems, nonetheless.

In the Southeast, for example, most of the theatre programs--especially at the large state universities--are sheltered under a humanities umbrella. Few of them offer the BFA degree. The undergraduate theatre major is buried in a core of wide-ranging general education requirements and--in spite of the American Theatre Association's Minimum Standards document, which advocates that one-quarter to one-third of the undergraduate student's total program for the BA degree be devoted to theatre classes--it is not uncommon to find state universities that require that less than one-quarter of the total program be devoted to the major. The thrust of such programs is toward the provision of a sound liberal arts education although often with the assumption that students are being prepared for later entry into professional schools or MFA programs. In such instances, many people might expect that undergraduate participation in a production would be deemphasized, that students would be encouraged toward the study of theatre as a discipline rather than toward vigorous participation in production and performance. Indeed, the Minimum Standards document mentioned above stresses the necessity of students' understanding of the skills and processes of performance and production much more than their acquiring large experience in these areas. It is not unusual to find that exactly the reverse is true; production seasons have literally become the *raison d'etre* for the existence of some theatre departments. And some theatre administrators in the Southeast are fearful that the addition of a resident professional company will simply compound what they perceive as an existing philosophical imbalance.

Many theatre people believe that theatre programs must have production components, of course; they argue that theatre students must have some access to laboratory experience. Curiously, however, in the Southeast, that function almost never exists alone as the acknowledged rationale for a production program. Theatre faculty offer other reasons: a creative outlet for youthful artists in music, dance, and the visual arts as well as for theatre students; an arena for the display of faculty professionalism; an extracurricular opportunity or "hobby" for the general student population; a showcase to heighten the visibility of the department, college, or university for the benefit of the campus development office; a fund-raising mechanism to support scholarships; or a con-

tribution to the cultural life of the community, functioning in much the same way as the library or the campus film series.

These are all worthy functions, and no one would deny that any academic theatre programs might legitimately espouse them. But such a variety of functions suggests, to at least some critics, a fundamental uneasiness about the undergraduate production programs, particularly the large, visible ones housed in liberal arts or general education colleges offering only the BA degree. Thus, some theatre administrators will argue that the addition of a resident professional company further obscures the theatre department's role of producing well-educated liberal arts graduates, while proponents of the resident theatre idea are inclined to shrug these arguments off as sour grapes. This dichotomy is real and troublesome to many educators in the Southeast, however. They argue that--given the lack of an undergraduate theatre program specifically designed to produce graduates trained for immediate entry into the profession--the value of the resident company must at least be rationalized on grounds other than pedagogic ones, especially if the company must be supported substantially by hard money drawn from the university's academic funds.

On campuses with MFA programs, an equally troublesome difficulty arises. Some theatre people argue that (as at Yale University, for example) the presence of a resident professional company that provides training opportunities for the graduate student obviates the need for an undergraduate major with a separate production program. In the Southeast, however, LORT companies and MFA conservatories sometimes exist within the same administrative structures (if not within the same facilities) as undergraduate programs. Such an arrangement appears both wasteful and philosophically unsound to some, especially if the undergraduate program is geared to the BA and not the BFA. Some would argue that if two campus production programs can survive, they are by definition successfully satisfying some audience's needs. However, it is not inappropriate to examine such needs or to ask whether fulfilling them is necessarily appropriate for a degree-granting institution.

Some Factors Affecting the Success of the University-Resident Company Liaison

The administrative structures within which resident professional companies function differ widely. At the University of North Carolina, for example, a single person functions as both chair of the department and executive producer of the resident company. That person hires all personnel: theatre managers and artistic directors for the company, faculty and staff for the department. The programs are articulated in the person of the chair/executive producer, and the lines of accountability are clear. Moreover, such an administrator is in a unique position vis-a-vis both the academic and the artistic integrity of the combined programs. Florida State University's arrangement is similar, though the units are housed in a school rather than in a college. The case is different at the University of Tennessee, where the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts appoints two persons, one as head of the department, the other as director of theatres and artistic director of the Clarence Brown Company. Though appointed by the Dean, the latter person is theoretically responsible directly to the department head. Theatre faculty at the University of Tennessee--some of whom work exclusively in the academic production program, some exclusively with the professional company, some in both and some in neither--are rarely certain as to whom they are supposed to be accountable. The resultant confusion is compounded by the lack of clearly stated goals and procedures for the liaison of the Clarence Brown Comapny with the undergraduate and graduate academic theatre programs.

While it is conceivable that a resident professional company could operate within a university for purposes different from those of the campus academic theatre program, such an arrangement seems uncommonly wasteful. As well, if conservatory or practicum articulation is desirable, it should probably not be left to accident: witness the continual effort to maintain the strength of the liaison at the University of North Carolina and Florida State. An explicit relationship between the two units, including curricular requirements for students, evaluation criteria, procedures and schedules, faculty qualifications and work loads, as well as some agreement as to the levels of talent and expertise to be required of graduates probably must be agreed upon by both units.

My sources agreed that an ultimate key to the success (however defined) of the university-resident company liaison is secure, predictable funding. It is a rare resident company anywhere that can operate on its own revenues, so adequate soft monies are necessary to insure that the professional company does not begin to drain money from academic budgets. A common strategy when soft money begins to fail--and especially if the company shares facilities with the academic program--is the lumping of professional with academic productions into a large and varied season, usually far more attractive to subscribers than either schedule would be in isolation. In this fashion, the programs can complement each other; and often, since revenue generally increases, the university can move toward direct support of the professional company. However, the unpredictability of such an arrangement is dangerous, warned one source in Texas. If revenues begin to fall, both the academic program and the company can collapse, while the responsible administrators stand around and try to figure out what monies belong to whom. There was no real agreement, however, among the sources contacted, as to whether separate, discrete funding for each unit was more desirable than a single, amalgamated budget for the joint program.

The question raised in this discussion are intended as indicators only of the urgent need for research into the nature of the relationship between resident professional companies and academic threatre programs. The sheer lack of information means that theatre students must make far less informed choices about higher eudcation and especially professional training than their fellows in accounting or audiology or mechanical engineering. More to the point, theatre administrators suddenly involved in instituting, maintaining, or trying to salvage resident professional companies

have such minimal data on which to base their judgments that it is hardly surprising to learn that of those eighteen administrators polled for this discussion, all had some experience with resident professional companies, but only four could point to companies still in existence.

Endnotes

[1]Robert E. Gard, Marston Balch and Pauline B. Temkin, eds. *Theatre in America: Appraisal and Challenge*, (Delmar Educational Research Services: Madison, Wisconsin, 1968), p. 171.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 86.

[3]"The Shame of Theatre Arts," *Change*, 6 (June, 1974), pp. 34-38.

[4]Joseph W. Zeigler, *Regional Theatre: The Revolutionary Stage* (University of Minnesota Press; Minneapolis, 1977), p. 249.

[5]The League of Resident Theatres in a New York based organization which assists its members with contracts and royalty arrangements. The letter designation of LORT contracts referes to the kind of arrangement the company has with Actor's Equity or other unions.

[6]*Profiles Five* (Theatre Communications Group, Inc.: New York, 1982).

[7]James D. Kriley, Calvin Pritner and Vera Mowry Roberts, "Minimum Standards for the Accreditation of Theatre Degree Programs in College and University," *Educational Theatre Journal*, 29, No. 4 (December, 1977), pp. 547-548.

THEATRE APPRECIATION:
A PILOT PROGRAM IN TELECOURSE WORK IN THEATRE

Dorothy Webb

For several semesters I kept tacked to the bulletin board by my desk a cartoon that pictured a large university lecture hall devoid of people. At the front of the room was a television screen and at each student desk a small tape recorder. For me this cartoon captured the essence of a serious threat posed by the technological age to an almost sacred relationship that can exist between teacher and student. I have not changed my mind. I still believe that what transpires between student and teacher--what happens within the mind and soul of both--is the essence of education. Nonetheless, I have come to believe that there are theatre courses, especially non-production courses in which television is able not only to substitute for regular classroom attendance but also to enhance the process of teaching and learning.

Current research in telecourses yields a list of advantages, some admittedly couched in Madison-Avenue hyperbole aimed, no doubt, at economically beleaguered administrators. For administrators the potential for reaching previously untapped students while simultaneously increasing enrollments looms large. This argument can be especially attractive to administrators who recognize the need to keep performance courses small but who also must reconcile FTEs. If the hope of immediately enlarged enrollments is the only, or even the major reason for using telecourses, however, the project is doomed to failure on at least two counts.

First, although the instructor may be able to handle somewhat larger classes, he or she will discover that a well taught telecourse requires more time than a regular class; thus, the instructor may need a reduced teaching load. Second, the initial costs for either leasing or developing the materials for telecourses can be high. Although initial expenses become more cost-effective as a course is repeated, the continuing costs are still considerable. (For example, in the theatre appreciation course taught at Indiana-Purdue University the postage charges alone will average $5.00 per student.)

Why then should one consider telecourses at all? There are some good reasons:

1. Such courses can reach students who might not otherwise enroll: persons who are homebound because of physical disability, age, transportation, geographical location, financial problems, or family responsibilities; or people whose jobs preclude their attendance at regular classes.

2. As life expectancy increases more people embrace the concept of life-long learning, non traditional educational methods will increase.

3. For certain theatre courses, the use of television is a particularly effective way to teach.

This paper focuses on two essentials necessary to realizing television's potential: first, the selection of courses (or portions of courses) that can be enhanced through visual instruction and second, the location and adaptation of existing programs or the development of new materials. Some courses in theatre history, theatre appreciation, and design and technology seem most suited to the telecourse format. Most instructors, aware that a "picture can be worth a thousand words," already use films, overhead transparencies, slides, and other video devices as well as well-illustrated books in their instruction. Traditionally students come to the classroom to view these materials. If a course devotes several class meetings to visual materials and if the instruction could be improved by adding more visuals, that course or portions of it might be profitably developed as a telecourse. In an urban university attending class may mean commuting thirty to forty-five minutes and struggling another thirty minutes looking for a parking place. Certainly for commuting students to be able to view materials in their own homes is an attractive alternative. Moreover, if the telecourse is aired more than once so that the student has not one but two opportunities to see the assignment, then the format seems even more inviting.

Once a course suited for television is identified, the next step is either to locate or to create the necessary materials. It may be possible to create many of the materials for a public access channel or a university owned station, but for a commercial station or for PBS, the materials must be of a quality high enough to attract non-student viewers. Few of us, at least in the beginning, have the expertise, time, money, or opportunities to develop films of the quality required (any more than we can write all of our own textbooks). Instructors, therefore, usually search out and select the best of what is available and adapt it to their needs.

The process for securing such materials varies, so do the rights to them. Some can be leased outright by the school or by a local station; others can be purchased; a few allow off-air taping, that is, the video

tapes can be duplicated for instructional use so long as a lease is in effect. It helps if the school or state belongs to an alliance or consortium, one of the major services of such a group is to negotiate group rentals and purchases for the membership. Such a consortium can reduce costs considerably. Other sources exist, however, and most campuses probably have a division, a center, or at least an administrative officer who can provide information about securing specific material.

Through whatever sources, videocassettes usually form the spine of any telecourse, but it is only the spine. How these materials are used, what is created to go with them, and how they are administered makes each course unique. Because few of the materials currently on the market are designed to meet the specific needs of theatre education, a great deal of adaptation is necessary. The remainder of this paper deals with a telecourse in theatre appreciation developed at Indiana Purdue University, Indianapolis.

The course in theatre appreciation is designed for non-majors at the freshman level. It is required of no one in the university, although non-majors in the school of liberal arts may elect it to help satisfy some of their core requirements. The course is offered to help enhance students' understanding and enjoyment of theatre. We want them to learn how theatre is created, as well as to become familiar with representative plays, playwrights, and periods.

"Play, Performance, and Perception," the package created by Miami-Dade Community College that we adopted, contains hour-long excerpts from fourteen plays. All are staged, costumed, lighted, and generally well directed and well acted. Only the first, *Miss Julie*, really focuses on the process of creating theatre. In addition, the accompanying textual materials focus more on the plays as dramatic literature than as theatre.

Because we wanted to stress the making of theatre, clarifying the roles of the various theatre artists and the collaborative nature of theatre, our department (with the help of WFYI, Indianapolis' local PBS) produced an hour long film, "A Look Behind the Scenes." This film followed the director of a play as he conferred with costume, scenery, and lighting designers. We also included interviews with several directors from professional, religious, community, and educational theatres in Indianapolis. This film, together with the one of *Miss Julie*, provided strong visual explanations about ways in which theatre is created. No other changes were made in the video sequences. Each film was aired once on a weekday and repeated on the weekend.

We augmented those sections of the textbook dealing with the elements of theatre with additional recommended readings and handouts. Later we added supplemental sheets throughout the course titled "Focus on Viewing" and subtitled with a specific topic such as "Symbolism in Design." These sheets helped students to focus on processes of theatre and to apply what they were seeing in the films.

After reading a great deal about telecourses, we also instituted other procedures:

1. We maintained weekly contact with each student either by mail or phone;

2. We gave weekly quizzes over the viewing and reading assignments. A packet of self-tests, supplemented by questions that we mailed out bi-weekly provided about fifty short-answer questions. Students marked answers on answer sheets that could be mechanically graded. They were graded and returned with a response sheet giving the rationale for the correct answers. These self-tests enabled students to check their own progress and enabled the instructor to spot potential problems and follow up with specific suggestions for each student's improvement;

3. We used the telephone in two ways: first, we established telephone hours, just as we hold office hours on campus, so that students knew when they could regularly reach us, and second, students could elect to have a telephone partner with whom they could discuss what they were learning, just as they might in a traditional class;

4. We offered "off-print capability," which allowed us to duplicate the films and have them available on campus. Not all contracts allow this option, but it is a decided plus. Students who, for whatever reason, had to miss a film or those who simply wanted to see it again could do so on campus at our instructional Media Center;

5. We required that all but physically home-bound students see and report on live theatre. Attendance was limited to a list of approved plays representing a wide variety of scripts, producing units, and physical plants. Upon the recommendation of previous students, we sponsor theatre parties for each class. Students are encouraged to attend the same performance, which is followed by a reception in the theatre, a tour backstage, and a visit with the director, designers, and actors; and

6. This fall we also will add two optional review sessions on campus scheduled before each major examination.

A survey of the sixty-four students enrolled in this course during the first year revealed four pertinent points:

1. Students were generally older than their on-campus counterparts. The average age was 31;

2. 50% were employed full-time outside the home;

3. 69.6% were earning degrees; and

4. 78% were enrolled both in the telecourse and on campus.

The first two statistics, the age of the students and their involvement with full-time work, are consistent with national averages. On the other hand, the high number of degree-seeking students and the even higher number of persons enrolled both in the telecourse and on campus is atypical. We had hoped to reach a larger percentage of people who might not otherwise be attached to the University. Two ways to achieve this goal would be to develop more extensive publicity and to offer the course through the Division of Continuing Education. Listing with continuing education would encourage people who are interested in the course, but not in the credit, to enroll. The fact that the bookstore sold more books than we had students might indicate that there is interest in such a non-credit course. Because telecourses are relatively new to the Indianapolis community, it will

probably take some time to develop the market.

The academic results were very satisfying. Tests and play reports verify that on the average the students did as well or better than on-campus students is understanding both the plays and production techniques. Students in the teleclasses elected to attend a larger number of performances than their on-campus counterparts. Their interest in theatre and their enthusiasm for seeing live performances were manifest both in telephone conversations and written work.

Perhaps the greatest growth occured in me. Forced to think through and examine every facet of this course in a way not mandated in on-campus teaching, I began to re-examine my approach to all classes. For those administrators and teachers who are considering telecourses, a beginning bibliography follows.

Bibliography

Linda S. Agler, and Theodore W. Pohrte. "College-Credit Courses by Open-Circuit Television." *Educational Technology*. October 1976, pp. 39-43.

Kamala Anandam. *Report on Student Performance in an Open Learning System (Open College) During the Year 1974-75*. Miami: Miami-Dade Community College (Open College), n.d. 28 pp.

Kamala Anandam. *Report on Student Performance in Open College During the Year 1975-76*. Miami: Miami-Dade Community College (Open College), n.d.

Kamala Anandam. *Semester Report: Open College, 1975-76*. Miami: Miami-Dade Community College (Open College, 1976.)

Kamala Anandam and Bess Fleckman. "Telephone Dialogue Intervention in Open Learning Instruction." *Journal of College Student Personnel*. May 1977, pp. 219-223.

Frances M. Aversa and David C. Forman. *Issues in the Evaluation of Education Television Programs*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Mid-America (Office of Marketing and Information), August 1976.

Dee Brock. *ITV Close-up; The First Six Years*. Dallas: DCCCD ITV Center, 1978.

Ellen Burch and Howard Myrick. *The Public Television Audience: A Closer Look*. Washington, DC: Corporation for Public Broadcasting, 1979.

Dallas County Community College District, Instructional Television Center. *Comparison of Telecourse and On-Campus Grade Distributions from the Spring Semester of 1978*. Dallas, Texas: Dallas County Community College District (Instructional Television Center), 1978.

Jerold Gruebel, "Working With Telecourses: A Cooperative TV Project in Indiana." *Indiana High Education Journal*. May 1981, pp. 56-59.

Gene I. Maeroff. "About Education. TV is Rarely Used as an Instructional Tool." *The New York Times*. 2 November 1977, p. 71.

S Walter Perry. *The Open University*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

W. Werner Prange, "Educational Technology: We Need a New Approach." *Public Telecommunications Review*. August 1973, pp. 12-15.

W. Werner Prange, Jacqueline Maki and Joseph R. Gaunt. "Defining Faculty Rights in Recorded Courseware." *Public Telecommunications Review*. April 1974, pp. 24-33.

Leslie Purdy, "Telecourse Students: How Well Do They Learn?" *Focus: Newsletter on Media Instruction*, Vol. II, No. 2 (n.d., distributed December 1978), pp. 7-10.

Leslie Purdy and Darrell Icenogle. *Classic Theatre: The Humanities in Drama, A Television Course for Credit* (Final Research Report). Costa Mesa, Calif.: Coast Community College District; and La Jolla, Calif.: University of California at San Diego (University Extension), 1976.

Steven Ryan, "Recruiting Students for Media Based Education." *Focus: Newsletter on Media Instruction*, Vol. II, No. 2 (n.d., distributed December 1978), pp. 13-14.

Richard W. Smith, "Educational Television Is Not Educating." *Change*. December-January 1978/1979, pp. 62-63.

Sivasailam Thiagarajan, "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Learner." In *Learning Via Telecommunications: Readings from "Audiovisual Instruction-3"* (reprinted from *Audio Visual Instruction*, January 1978, pp. 44-45). Washington, DC: Association for Educational Communications & Technology, 1978.

Norman E. Watson and Bernard J. Luskin, "A Credit Telecourse on the Classics" *Community and Junior College Journal*. May 1975, pp. 10-11.

R. Yarrington, (ed.) *Using Mass Media for Learning*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979.

James J. Zigerell, "A Brief Historical Survey." *In Using Mass Media for Learning*, edited by Roger Yarrington. pp. 1-12. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979.

SOVIET THEATRE AND TELEVISION IN MUTUAL ENHANCEMENT

Miriam Morton

The first of September--the first day of school in the USSR. Part of that day the first-grade classrooms are empty. The children are at the theatre. It has become a custom in the Soviet Union for school beginners to attend a performance at a professional children's theatre or a children's program at a theatre for adults. In a way, the boys and girls simultaneously begin their academic schooling and their aesthetic education through drama.

In mid-morning, kindergartners are watching and participating through their activities in a television program designed especially for them, and broadcast so that nearly all fourteen million children in kindergartens (as well as those not attending preschool institutions) can benefit from the program, which offers them dramatized fairy tales, puppet plays, and musical scenes.

These two practices reflect the extensive use both of live theatre and the performing arts on television in a common effort for early acculturation, that is, early conditioning of children to the cultural patterns whose objective is to develop their sensitivities and sensibilities.

But is the partnership of theatre and television in the Soviet Union an uneasy one? Does it threaten the continuation of the theatre's traditional popularity? In the Soviet Union both theatre and television are mass media. Because of the uncommonly large number of professional theatres, their large repertories, and the immense audiences of all ages which attend them, theatre in all its various genres is unquestionably a mass medium.

From the time the first adult play was staged in Russia in 1747, from the year the first dramatic theatre was opened in St. Petersburg in 1756, and from the time the first professional children's theatre was opened in 1919, the Russian public has supported the dramatic arts. Such support extends to the many nationalities in their respective republics and regions. Today there are at least 600 professional theatres playing in forty-two languages. They have their own premises, permanent companies, expanding repertories, and teaching facilities or studios. The theatres function about ten months of the year in their homes and most are required by the Ministries of Culture, which determines the size of subsidies, to tour in summer and in holiday seasons. The touring brings performances to communities that do not have their own companies or it brings variety to those that have a theatre. A visit from a company also can improve the work of amateur drama groups that exist all over the country. Every company playing for adults is required to include children's plays in its repertory, thus greatly increasing the overall audience.

Here is but one example of size of repertory and size of audience. Moscow's twenty-five theatres have repertories of eight to thirty plays, offering the city's theatregoers a chance to see about 500 plays annually, ranging from world and Russian classics to contemporary plays of Soviet and foreign dramatists, especially American ones. As for theatre attendance: in Soviet Estonia, with a population of about one and a half million, the yearly theatre attendance exceeds the population by two to three hundred thousand. Demand exceeds the availability of seats nearly everywhere.

With an abundance of drama companies, resident training facilities, well-established institutes for the theatrical arts, in addition to the many studios, and with state subsidies, it would seem that professional Soviet theatre would not need or want involvement with another mass medium, in this case, television. Such probably would be true if Russia were not a socialist society with cultural goals designed to bring the arts to the population as a whole, maintaining standards in all the mass media in order to realize this objective. Involvement of theatre with television also would be less if this were not a country with a tradition of the performing arts.

In Soviet culture television is regarded as a medium which has a special power to democratize the aesthetic education of the populace. Thus it is seen, and used, as a contributing partner in the mass cultivation of all arts. Television works in unison and for similar goals with theatre because television programmers honor both the traditional and the revolution-bred concepts and standards for professioal theatre.

In the Soviet Union aesthetic education is based on the principle that it is an integral component of the overall education of children and of the continuing education of adults. In the humanist tradition, aesthetic education in the USSR is viewed as an important factor in personality development and in the perception of the good life.

It is through responsiveness to the aesthetic elements in the natural world, in human relationships, and in the visual and performing arts, that young and adult citizens develop into individuals responsive to those moral values through which the individual and society flourish. Aesthetics and ethics, according to this principle, have a symbiotic association, for there is believed to be a strong affinity between enlightenment through the arts and the cultivation of human values. Socialist humanism merely extends the application of this humanist principle to all the people.

The interaction between aesthetics and ethics is expressed by the American humanist philosopher, George Santayana: *I can draw no distinction--save for academic programmes--between moral and aesthetic values; beauty being a good, is a moral good . . . . harmony, which might be called an aesthetic principle, is also the principle of health, of justice, and of happiness.* In support of the role thus assigned to the arts, let me quote André Gide: "Art for art's sake? Certainly. But why hold it to so little!"

Last year in an interview in Moscow, Vladimir Razumnyi, director of the Research Institute for the Aesthetic Education of Youth Through the Mass Media, functioning within the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences said: *The fact is that the ubiquity of television and its continuous technological improvements are changing our very methods of aesthetic education in the kindergarten, the school, and in the home, as it renders the process more flexible, mobile, coordinated, and contemporary.* But he added: *Nevertheless, I do not advocate that television is to replace the theatre, the music or dance concert, the visit to the art gallery. Experiencing art in the traditional ways has its own unquestionable advantages in the process of aesthetic education.*

In the Soviet Union all television is public. It is state financed, to the extent of one billion rubles a year. There are no commercials. The medium is in the hands of the Central State Committee for Television and Radio of the USSR. Working with the heads of similar committees in the various replublics, the Central State Committee constitutes a separate Ministry in the Council of Ministers, a central government body. This Ministry, in regular consultation with leading educators, artists, and other cultural specialists, sets cultural policy and standards, as well as the qualifications for creative personnel, recommends and reviews programs, and determines appropriations. I believe that those exercising leadership and control do so with responsibility for the high goals set for the mass media. Control with social responsibility and respect for creativity can be as constructive as freedom practiced with such responsibility and respect--it is when either is irresponsible and claims justification for excesses in the name of a sanctified principle, that culture suffers.

There are ninety-eight television sets per 100 families in the most populated areas. There are four channels, with Channel 1 reaching 85% of viewers. Channel 4 has recently been reserved for programs of the performing arts. All programming on Channel 1 and Channel 4 is in color.

Regarded as an art in itself, because of its distinctive communicativeness and visual elements, television is used mainly as a means for informal education in the theatrical arts. It is not used in theatre education in the formal sense. That is, there are no televised courses offered either for any type of academic matriculation or credit, or for professional training. It is believed that the professionalism required of the creative people in theatrical establishments cannot be taught that way. It is also accepted that there are adequate facilities for training actors, directors, scenic artists, playwrights, theatre administrators in the traditional way--training them in close contact with live theatre. This is thought to be the best way.

Television contributes mainly in two ways to informal education or appreciation of theatre. First, it brings video-taped performances of established companies to large numbers of viewers across the country, and second, it advances appreciation of the various elements in the performing arts; it thus helps the viewer to develop into a more perceptive theatre-lover, one better able to derive enlightenment and enjoyment from a good play, well staged, and one better able to appreciate the fine arts of acting, directing, or playwriting. Such programs develop in a person only a sensitivity to the aesthetics of the stage arts, but also valuable insights into character and human situations in contemporary and historical perspectives.

In the minds of Soviet educators there is no distinction between informal education and learning appreciation. Leading a person to appreciate an aspect of an art is seen as an educative process. Moreover, the appreciator in a seuse validates the formal education, training, and work of the professional, for without an appreciative, perspective audience, neither such education and training nor such work would realize its main purpose--to communicate with an audience.

Then, briefly, what are some of the television programs which seek to improve theatre appreciation?

In addition to the plays of such theatres as the Moscow Art, the Vakhtangov, the Theatre of Satire, the Sovremmenik, the Leningrad Gorky, video-taped at performance and broadcast through nation-wide channels, there also are many plays done at the television centers for television screening. Leading actors and directors from the professional theatres are at times invited to perform in or direct them. These plays are often shown on special orbits so that they reach mainly viewers who have limited or no access to live theatre.

Channel 1, which reaches 85% of the country's viewers, offers a program titled, "At a Theatre Party" (literally, "Drama in the Guest Room")--which is an improvised social occasion. The "host" is an actor, a different one for the different segments of the series. He has invited a few leading theatre professionals from companies in different localities, including one or two from the national republics. There is small talk about the theatre. The guests act out parts of their favorite plays, comment on director-actor interaction, and sing selections from musicals or songs from

plays. The aim of this program is to improve drama appreciation. "At a Theatre Party" is addressed mainly to a youth audience, but it also is popular with adults.

Another program has a panel of young people (in their late teens and early twenties) and takes the form of a group interview with a stage personality about his or her career. This weekly program seeks to attract young people to the profession, by broadening their perspectives about theatre, its inner workings, and its artistic aspirations.

Another program marks special events in the history of prominent theatres. An example was the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Vakhtangov Theatre, which opened a century ago with a production of Gozzi's *Princess Turandot*, a play which has had quite different stagings over the years. The occasion was marked on television by the presentation of three of the formerly staged versions of the play. With so many theatres of historical importance, this program offers enticing theatre and attracts a wide television audience.

Still another program, broadcast on Saturday nights, is comedic. It is designed to sharpen the critical faculties of the viewers by satirizing, or by giving a farcical rendition of, a familiar scene in a well-known play. The format is for three male players and a primadonna to act out a scene, letting humor have its sway.

Then there is a television show called "Theatrical Encounters." It is a conversation between professional entertainers. In one program a soccer goalie, Vladimir Tretyak, commented on the pros and cons of being in the public limelight, in an exchange on the subject with a stage actor, a director, Alla Pugacheva, and a clown, Yuri Nikulin.

"The Day of the Arts," is an annual event in Tashkent, capital of the Soviet Republic of Uzbekistan. On this day actors, directors, and other theatre professionals meet the general public at the State Uzbek Academic Theatre to talk about scheduled new productions and to play scenes from them. This event is always televised for viewers throughout the republic.

In the city of Samarkand, in the same republic, an ancient amphitheatre has recently been restored. From the beginning, equipment was installed for video-taping the open-air performances of plays.

Amateur theatre is a national pastime, involving children and adults. It, too, has useful television exposure. Performances by amateur groups originating in industrial plants, state farms, or recreational centers for children are televised when they meet high enough standards, thus instructing and inspiring other amateur groups to do better. There are televised regional and inter-city tournaments of amateur drama judged by theatre professionals and drama critics.

In the case of non-Russian televised plays, the original company provides its own translation into Russian or into another Soviet language, to make certain that the original is faithfully rendered. Voice-over for such performances is most carefully done. The televised plays from Georgia, Latvia, and Kazakhstan have an unusually large following because of their reputation.

Lest anyone may believe that television is about to supplant conventional theatre, let me sketch in a scene described in an issue of the bi-monthly magazine, *Teatral 'naya Zhizn* (*The Life of Theatre*): In Vologda, an agricultural region in the north-central part of Russia, a Theatre for Young Spectators has just been erected in the capital. Every afternoon and on weekends, busloads of children and adolescents from the country-side arrive at the theatre. The comprehensive plan is to bring live theatre to all the young people of the region by bussing them to the capital to attend theatre. An effort to avoid discrimination against rural youngsters as theatre-goers. The young generation in the country-side of Vologda should not become television addicts in lieu of live-theatre enthusiasts.

Oleg Yefremov, artistic director of the Moscow Art Theatre says: "Complacency is alien to all art." Complacency is certainly alien to those in the Soviet Union involved in theatre or in television.

ANATOMY OF THE STRUGGLE

Susan Pearson-Davis

This is a report about the termination of a prestigious children's drama program at a major university. It is not an unbiased report since I was a faculty member in that children's drama program. It is, rather, a call to theatre administrators to recognize the value, as well as the vulnerability, of children's drama.

In academia, programs come and programs go for all sorts of good and bad reasons. So why write about the children's drama program at the University of Washington? Aside from the fact that is was one of the largest and oldest such programs in the country, it seems representative of unfortunate patterns that seem to have appeared in other university theatre programs. The University of Washington was not the first major state university with a well-respected theatre department to cut or greatly diminish its children's program. Florida State University and the Universities of Minnesota, Michigan, and Tennessee, among others, have done so within the last ten years. As elsewhere, budget crises, tenure questions, and the role of children's drama in the mission of the department all figured heavily in the Washington case. An even more important factor, however, was the administrations apparent lack of understanding and respect for children's drama as a field: lack of vision about what chilren's drama can do for university theatre programs.

Children's Drama: Negatives and Positives

Before describing the University of Washington case in particular, I will discuss some aspects of children's drama that are often overlooked in administrative decision-making. In doing so, I will be using the term "children's drama" to include both creative drama and children's theatre. Creative drama is an informal, process-oriented form guided by a leader for purposes of the mental, physical, emotional, social, and aesthetic growth of participants. Children's theatre involves formally mounted productions performed by adult actors for child or youth audiences.

The lack of understanding and respect for childrn's drama is pervasive. In the first place, children's drama is a relative newcomer to academia, its major growth coming in this century, after psychologists discovered that children are not just miniature adults but that they think and perceive differently; their cognitive and emotional structures change in definable, predictable ways in the various stages through which they grow. This developmental difference affects how and what they will respond to in the theatre, and is one of the major concerns of children's drama at the university level. Creative drama, which focuses on appropriate teaching methods for various developmental levels, had its official beginnings with the work of Winifred Ward at Northwestern University during the progressive education movement of the 1930's. Its theoretical literature is relatively small and new and draws on both education and theatre. Because of its interdisciplinary nature, there is continuing controversy over whether its true home is education or theatre.

Children's theatre, although around somewhat longer, has had an unfortunate reputation of being second-rate, a reputation too often deserved. Much children's theatre is done by well-meaning amateurs who lack understanding and ability both in theatre and with children. Scripts are often hastily written by such amateurs and somehow find their way into print causing the well-known surfeit of poor scripts. As a matter of fact, the proportion of good scripts to bad in children's theatre is probably similar to that to that in the main body of dramatic literature. Examining and developing performance forms and scripts to meet children's developmental needs and abilities is the focus of children's theatre in universities. Programs that are large and comprehensive enough to offer both creative drama and children's theatre at graduate levels are especially important to the development of this relatively new academic field.

In a very real sense, then, university programs in children's drama are in a relatively early stage. Unfortunately, administrators often fail to see beyond the inevitable first lurchings to find the positive aspects of children's drama. Among the most obvious and important of these is that children's theatre provides jobs, especially to young actors, directors, and designers. Likewise, actors who also have some teaching experience in creative drama have an easier time finding interim or part-time employment as artists-in-the-schools or in recreation programs. Too, children's drama, especially a touring show, is good public relations and community service; and

it can be an additional source of income through ticket sales and grants.

Also obvious but sometimes overlooked is the value of children's drama to actor training. Audiences of children are volatile and energetic. If bored, they are unforgiving. The presentational acting styles often used in children's theatre, shifting from role to narration and from character to character in the same play, for example, are good practice for performing many kinds of adult plays. Children's theatre also exposes student actors to the discipline needed in touring and of adjusting to vastly different performance spaces from show to show. Actors who have not developed their vocal and physical skills will not long survive in children's theatre.

Probably the value of children's drama that is most difficult to define and most difficult for theatre people to appreciate, is its function in the education of the child. Involvement in creative drama challenges children to develop concentration, imagination, flexibility, and problem-solving skills that are becoming more and more necessary to cope with accelerating change. Whether drama is integrated into other subjects in the curriculum or taught as a separate discipline, it provides opportunities for children to practice social skills, such as role-taking, and cooperation. Recent research in right and left-brain processing supports the importance of integrating certain techniques of theatre training in children's general education. Jean Huston, in a speech to the Children's Theatre Association of America at the 1979 American Theatre Association Convention, stated: *The child without access to a stimulating arts program is being systematically cut off from most of the ways in which he can perceive the world. His brain is being systematically damaged. In many ways he is being de-educated.* Since drama combines all the arts and deals primarily in actions, it is the most closely integrated with children's everyday living.

Theatre professionals often do not see the education of the next generation as part of their responsibility. They want to leave that to the people in education. But education is extremely suspicious of the arts, mistakenly considering them "frills." If theatre professionals will not share their skills with teachers of children and with children themselves--who will?

Such issues have kept children's drama professionals fighting to keep their programs alive in universities. The events leading to the termination of the thirty-five year old children's drama program at the University of Washington provide a case in point. Perhaps by recognizing the patterns of the problem we may find mutually beneficial solutions.

Although it is tempting, it is not possible to pinpoint the blame for the University of Washington case. The situation was too complex to allow oversimplification. A series of pressures from federal and state budget cuts that affected the University combined with priorities of the School of Drama and of the College of Arts and Sciences to start the action in motion.

Before the termination proceedings began, the children's drama program was a comprehensive program with three full-time faculty. It offered graduate and undergraduate courses in creative drama, children's theatre, and puppetry. A group of seven to ten MFA students were in residence, while numerous undergraduates took classes and performed in children's theatre productions. The children's drama program had developed under the direction of Agnes Haaga and Geraldine Siks during the 40's and 50's when the School of Drama was the hub of theatre in Seattle. Meeting the needs of the community was a high priority for the School of Drama at that time. In fact, children's drama had been added to the University's curriculum when an active community group demanded it and raised the money to pay for a faculty member to initiate it. After several years, the School of Drama took over the financial support and the children's drama program rose to national prominence.

A similar link between a flourishing program and a community's demand for children's drama existed in other universities. Indeed, the funding for Winifred Ward's work at Northwestern University was provided by the community and the public school of Evanston, not by the University. Because children's drama programs bring local families and their children to the university and send university students out to perform in the community, it is not surprising that such programs usually do better at universities that have community service and outreach as a priority.

The national prominence of the University of Washington program was due in large part to the achievements of Siks and Haaga. Both were made Fellows of the American Theatre Association, and Siks recently received ATA's highest honor, the Award of Merit. Siks' books are considered major texts in the field and have been translated into several languages. In spite of their national reputation, however, many faculty in the School of Drama did not seem to recognize what these women were accomplishing. Both were specialists and neither were teaching classes in the "core" drama curriculum. The rest of the department perceived them as different and separate. This separation from the mainstream is a point of tension in many theatre departments, and it was a factor in the eventual termination of the program at Washington.

In the 60's and 70's, Seattle theatres grew more numerous and more sophisticated. Many of them were created and staffed by graduates and former faculty of the School of Drama. Perhaps the extraordinary vigor of theatre in Seattle was due in part to the thousands of children who experienced drama from early childhood in programs developed by Siks and Haaga, and who became the enthusiastic audiences that are buying tickets today. However, with this increased sophistication, Seattle theatres began casting more shows out of New York. At the same time the philosophy of the School of Drama began to change. It gradually turned away from local involvement to seek more national visibility. When a new chairman was appointed in 1974, he made it clear that his top priority would be the

Professional Actor Training Program. The PATP, as it is known, is a conservatory program, giving intensive training to forty or so highly talented, hand-picked, acting students. The MFA Design Program provides the production support. These two programs function almost independently of the School's other degree programs: the BA program, the MFA directing program, and the children's drama MFA program. PATP productions and classes are open only to PATP students and there is no overlapping of faculty between PATP and other programs.

The conservatory configuration of PATP allows the School of Drama to be a member of the League of Professional Theatre Training Schools, an affiliation that brings substantial benefits to the department in terms of money and national visibility. The League funnels thousands of dollars from the National Endowment for the Arts into scholarships for PATP students and provides administrative services for national auditions that attract top students.

Compared to the benefits of League membership, the national visibility being garnered by the children's drama program had relatively little impact on the administration. In spite of the fact that the children's drama faculty and the students were winning national awards, serving in major offices of professional associations and being hired in some of the most prestigious theatre and university positions in the field, the administration felt children's drama was useful but not essential to theatre.

The underlying assumption here should be examined. Theatre departments with a conservatory structure and an image of themselves as professional training programs often want nothing to do with children's theatre or theatre appreciation or amateurism.

Children's drama, like "theatre appreciation" emphasizes teaching the general student and conservatory programs seem to consider that an unworthy goal. Thomas K. Hearn, Jr., in his 1980 address to the Association of College, University, and Community Arts Administrators (reprinted in the February 1982 issue of *Theatre News*) pointed out the unfortunate outcome of this orientation: *In educational programs in the arts the only acceptable calling is to become a performer, preferably a solo performer. That is the only vocation given important and primary reinforcement in the educational process. If one just happens not to make it as a performer, which almost 100 percent do not, the next best thing is to teach others who will also fail to become solo performers. . . We are mainstreaming an enormous artistic educational enterprise which has as its primary--almost sole-- purpose an outcome as rare as the proverbial black swan.* So, the very necessary process of deepening the aesthetic awareness of the general public that should be encouraged is minimized and devalued at a time when, for our survival we need a population that is moved by beauty as much or more than it is moved by violence; that understands conserving and preserving as much or more than it understands consuming and building nuclear weapons.

There is no inherent reason that professional training need exclude work with child audiences, especially in view of the benefits that such experiences provide. But often, when children's drama programs are cut, it is done to "protect" a professional training program. In the battle for dollars, children's drama programs are usually perceived as a threat rather than an ally. Somehow the money-making potential of children's drama is forgotten or ignored.

Here again, a look at the University of Washington may shed some light on the reasons why a more creative approach is not taken with budget problems. Pressures brought on by the threat of large and imminent budget cuts become inextricably limited to issues of tenure and program centrality.

In May, 1982, NEA money coming into PATP from the League was threatened by federal budget cuts. The School of Drama risked losing a dollar amount equivalent to two faculty salaries. There were four non-tenured people on the faculty whose salaries could be reallocated to cover the lost funds--two were in PATP and two were in the children's drama program. Thus, the Children's Drama would be the first program cut if cuts turned out to be necessary.

Beyond the tenure issue there were other factors that put children's drama in a first-cut position. The Children's Drama Program was the easiest to cut without forcing a complete reorganization of the School of Drama. Unlike the acting, design, and directing programs, no other program was dependent on Children's Drama for its day to day functioning. Thus, the very specialization that had been so important to the development of children's drama as a field was now making it an easy target for cuts.

In the fall of 1981, the state was hit with a huge budget crisis. The university, faced with immediate cuts of up to 20%, declared a State of Financial Emergency which included the suspension of tenure, even for tenured faculty. This state action prevented any hope of tenure for the children's theatre faculty. There were questions about whether the tenure action was based on financial pressure.

When the faculty questioned a tenure decision that would deny tenure to any of the children's theatre faculty, the administration insinuated that finances were not the only problem. It appeared that children's drama was an un-tenurable field.

Debates in faculty meetings raged over the next few months. Resolutions regarding departmental support for the children's drama program were passed and then rescinded. Letter-writing campaigns were mounted by graduate students. In spite of these efforts, there was still no administrative support. This, along with the College Council's limited understanding of children's drama as a field and the continuing financial crisis, made the prospects for getting tenure for any of the faculty remote. One faculty member resigned in order to devote full time to writing plays. The faculty then had to decide whether to replace that person with another person in children's drama. The faculty vote resulted in a tie which was broken by the Chair and which gave the position to the MFA design program. Subsequently the second children's theatre faculty member resigned. In May, 1982, demoralized by the budget situation and the

administration's attitude toward the field of children's drama, the faculty voted to terminate the program rather than enfeeble it.

According to futurists, a civilization that stops valuing its youth, in effect, stops believing or investing in its future. That is a sure sign of the civilization's decline. Hopefully, theatre educators and university administrators will resist that decline and realize that professional theatre training need not, indeed cannot afford to exclude the education of future audiences from its central mission. We in children's drama may have to redouble our efforts to advocate our program to our colleagues in the core curriculum, and we may need to weigh the benefits of specializing in children's drama against those of teaching classes in a department's mainstream. But children's drama will survive. Drama and play are, after all, a profound and fundamental part of the human developmental process, a rich repository for evolution and adaptation.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE THEATRE TOURING COMPANY

Joanne E. Tracy

Gallaudet College, the only liberal arts college in the world for the deaf, was established in 1864. Theatre as an extra-curricular activity has been occuring since 1892. The Theatre Arts Department was established in 1963. The Gallaudet College Theatre Touring Company was developed in 1977 in response to requests for on-site performances.

Prior to 1977, the Theatre Arts Department responded to such requests with what was termed an "Outside Program". This forerunner of the Touring Company used drama students who rehearsed each program as the request came in. The program consisted of selections of poems and songs, and skits. These early performances were funded by the sponsoring group covering transportation costs, meals, and accommodations.

As the department received more requests, the need was seen for a permanent program which would be rehearsed and maintained throughout the year. This kind of company has a two-fold purpose: it serves as a practical learning experience for the students, and at the same time is a visible outreach effort on behalf of the college.

To date all of the productions have used original scripts. All of these scripts have offered insights into deafness as a factor affecting communication settings with deaf and hearing people. *How?* (1977-79) was written by Richard Peterson and served as an introduction to sign language and deafness and showed the creation of the world through a series of sign language pictures. *When. . .*(1979-80), by William Moses, was a series of stories and songs about deaf children growing up and their experiences with family, friends, and teachers. *That Makes Two of Us* (1980-82), by Bernard Bragg, was a romantic comedy about a deaf man who relies on sign communication and his influences on the oral deaf woman he meets. *What* (1981-83), by Gilbert C. Eastman, through a variety of short scenes, depicts the beauties of American Sign Language and its power to create visual images.

Since 1977, the various productions have been seen by over 20,000 people located in cities from coast to coast. The company has performed in facilities that vary from traditional theatres to cafeterias, churches, and ballrooms. This year's bookings include a spring break trip to St. Croix in the Virgin Islands.

The directors and designers strive for simplicity in sets, costumes, and lights. Finances are a consideration as the company is basically self-supporting, covering expenses from fees charged to sponsoring organizations. When performing in the metropolitan Washington area, a basic fee of $200-250 is charged, depending upon the distance to be travelled. In the event the company is required to travel by air, transportation and related costs are covered by the sponsor in lieu of fees.

Since the performers are all full-time students, consideration has to be given to their class requirements. Because of these considerations, we try to limit bookings to nights and weekends. Many of our requests, however, come from public schools for daytime performances. We estimate that only one in every four requests can be honored because of this system.

These limitations have led to discussion for establishing a paid, full-time company rather than volunteers receiving college credit. The basic concept is that graduating majors would go into the company for the year following graduation. This kind of structure would, of course, change the funding system.

Until funding for this kind of effort is obtained, the department will continue to provide quality educational entertainment for its varied audiences on this limited basis.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE:
A CALL TO PARTICIPATE IN DEFINING THE FIELD

Theodore Clevenger, Jr.

Consider two paradoxes:

(1) Everyone knows what "communication" is but efforts to define it lead to an endless variety of strikingly different conceptualizations.

(2) Most academics profess to understand what it means to study "Communication" but curricula and research programs differ to a degree that some find charming, others alarming.

Charming or alarming, communication administrators spend little time on such paradoxes. At our present level of insight into communication as a process and communication as an academic field they contribute little to the solution of daily problems or the resolution of larger philosophical or policy issues. Still, like a crick in the neck, they remain a vague background discomfort that from time to time calls itself forcibly to our attention, especially when we are pushed off balance or shift our gaze from one place to another.

Presumably the better we understand a thing the better we can manage it. Because our collective understanding of both communication and Communication is confused, so too is our collective management of communication education in academe.

Certainly we can point to many coherent, quality programs in broadcasting, public relations, speech, theatre and other special fields. However, differences within any specialization are at least as great as similarities and except for programs falling under the quasi-political control of national governing boards each program seems to spring from a different organizing principle. As we move from one college or university to another we find inconsistent distinctions and overlapping jurisdictions.

According to one view these irregularities matter little, for the pragmatic reality is not communication as a generic field of study but the specific program(s) on the local campus. This attitude serves best when conditions are favorable to growth and individual programs prosper. In most respects it has proved congenial for the past quarter century when growth of communication programs of all types was phenomenal.

Of late, though, there are signs that growth has slowed nationally. Some of the decline in growth rate is due to external causes: the awkward timing of an international recession, a glut on certain job markets such as theatre, journalism and broadcast production, and the graduation of the "baby boom" generation.

But some of the decline in growth rate can be attributed to internal causes. Some communication programs have failed to expand their horizons so as to accommodate new opportunities so that important segments of the field which should have been theirs are preempted by other schools or departments. On many campuses where there are two or more programs in communication (such as journalism and speech or theatre and broadcasting) competition leads to duplication and bickering to lost opportunity.

The internal factors limiting growth of communication programs and enrollments nationally are exacerbated by our inability to articulate a consensus definition of either communication or Communication. Most of us would argue that fundamental world realities between now and the year 2000 point toward further rapid growth of communication education. Yet that growth may be stunted or its process destructive to extant programs. Through continued inattention to basic issues, it could even damage the credibility of the field. The time has come for us to undertake once again a definition of the field of Communication.

The sort of definition we need would be broad enough to include all of the professions and fields of study that common sense associates with Communication, but exclusive enough to eliminate those whose concerns are irrelevant. It would illuminate both the linkages and the natural divisions within the field and help us grasp the relationships between various communication specialities and the many branches of the arts, sciences and humanities. It would be useful to scholars, teachers, students and administrators, and it would help the broader public understand who we are and what we are about.

In all likelihood the ideal definition of communication as a process will continue to elude us for some time to come; but it may now be possible to derive a useful definition of Communication as a field of study. We need not fear that such a definition would lead to lockstep uniformity for Communication is far too diverse a field and serves too great a variety of constituencies to allow that. We can hope that a meaningful definition of the field will guide development into more productive channels and point the way toward coherent cooperative ventures among the communication specialties. Within

the field great diversity will remain, but a definition could serve as a map to its complex and varied geography.

During the coming year ACA will undertake three convergent thrusts toward developing a coherent definition of Communication as a field of study. (1) A series of survey studies of communication scholars and administrators will map the heirarchy of concerns within those disciplines and fields traditionally associated with communication. (2) A task force of administrators, scholars and teachers will undertake an analysis and classification of areas of specialization within the broad field of communication and explore their relationships. (3) Convention programs for regional and national associations will provide a continuing forum for review of these efforts in progress as well as development and exchange of additional views.

Participation is invited in all phases of this developmental process. Broad participation is indeed essential for success in this venture will call for every bit of available information and insight.

ACA members interested in participating in or contributing to any phase of this effort are encouraged to contact President Clevenger. In particular, position papers are sought to serve as input to the task force or stimulus materials for convention programs.

Most administrators hold more or less well-articulated views on the nature of the field and structure of its components. Now is the time to explicate those views and share them with a larger audience. Working together we can fashion a workable definition of the field of Communication and at last meet a long-standing challenge whose time has come.

ACA NEWS

1982 *Bulletin* Manuscript Information

For the first time since the Editor began keeping records, the number of unsolicited manuscripts submitted for consideration by the *Bulletin* fell below forty. The information that follows is for the referreed unsolicited papers received during 1982

		Unsolicited Manuscripts	
Topic	Received	Rejected	Accepted
Graduate Assistants	1		1
Program Revision	4	2	2
Telephone Communication	1		1
Course Evaluations	2	1	1
Citation Patterns	2		2
Personnel Careers	1		1
Public Relations	2	1	1
Hierarchical Communication	1		1
Competency Testing	1	1	
Lobbying	2	1	1
Article Counting	5	3	2
Beginning Course	2	2	
Chair Evaluations	1		1
Chair Burnout	1	1	
Student Recruiting	2	1	1
Interdisciplinary Programs	1		1
Forensics	1		1
Business Perceptions	1	1	
Business School Classes	1	1	
Minority Students	1	1	
Self-Study	1	1	
Canadian Programs	1	1	
TOTALS	35	18	17

1982 Referees

William Arnold, Arizona State University
Larry Barker, Auburn University
David Berg, Purdue University
Bert Bradley, Auburn University
Kenneth Brown, University of Massachusetts
David Clavier, Blue Cross of Florida
Theodore Clevenger, Florida State University
Isa Engleberg, Prince George's Community College
Kenneth Frandsen, University of New Mexico
Gustav Friedrich, University of Oklahoma
Al Goldberg, University of Denver
Jim Grissinger, Otterbein College
Mary Francis HopKins, Louisiana State University
Thomas Kane, University of Pittsburgh
Lorayne Lester, University of Tennessee
James McBath, University of Southern California
Gerald Miller, Michigan State University
Roger Nebergall, University of Illinois
James Phipps, Cedarville College
Michael Quinn, University of Texas
Jack Rhodes, University of Utah
Malcolm Sillars, University of Utah

John Sullivan, University of Virginia
Anita Taylor, George Mason University
Andrew Wolvin, University of Maryland

Darlyn Wolvin, Prince George's Community College
Jane Work, National Association of Manufacturers

8 Constitutional Amendments Approved

The eight Constitutional amendments and the four amendments to the By-Laws which were published in the August, 1982, issue of the *Bulletin* were all approved at the Association Business meeting held in Louisville on November 5. The Constitution as amended will be published in a future issue of the *Bulletin*.

Ted Clevenger Assumes Presidency for 1983

Ted Clevenger, Dean of the College of Communication at Florida State University, Tallahassee, succeeded to the Presidency of ACA on January 1, 1983. He was named President-Elect a year ago and under the Constitution, as amended, automatically became President. As President he is responsible for the leadership of the Association and for planning the 1983 Seminar.

President Celvenger succeeded Lorayne Lester of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

The New President-Elect: James E. Roever

At a meeting of the Executive Committee in 1982, James E. Roever, Dean of the College of Letters and Science at the University of Wisconsin, Whitewater, was named ACA President-Elect for 1983. As President-Elect, Roever will become Association President in 1984. As President-Elect, he also is responsible for the programs at the 1983 Convention to be held in Washington, DC at the Washington Hilton Hotel from November 10-13.

In addition, Roever will coordinate ACA programs at the WSCA, SSCA, CSSA and ECA regional conventions in 1984.

Executive Committee Welcomes 3 New Members

With the retirement of Stephen Archer, University of Missouri, Columbia, Judy Goldberg, Arapahoe Community College, and John Jellicorse, University of North Carolina, three chairs began service on the Executive Committee on January 1, 1983:

Paul Batty, Head of the Communication Division at Parkland College in Champaign, Illinois;

Patti Gillespie, Head of the Department of Communication Arts and Theatre, University of Maryland, College Park; and

Jon Whitmore, Head of the Theatre Division at West Virginia University in Morgantown.

These three administrators will serve on the Executive Committee through 1985.

Incorporation Approved

At the meeting of the Executive Committee on November 3, 1982, the Articles of Incorporation were approved unanimously on a roll call vote. The Committee then presented the Articles for approval by the general membership at the Association Business meeting on November 5, 1982. A Division of the House brought unanimous approval by the membership.

The Association has now applied for a 501-C-3 rating by the Internal Revenue Service, as well as for other government benefits that incorporation allows.

Texas Forms State ACA Affiliate

At the state convention of the Texas Speech Communication Association, a group of eighteen chairpersons met on October 7, 1982, to discuss mutual problems and concerns. During the course of the discussion, the group decided to form a state affiliate which would, in turn, become an affiliate of TSCA. By working with both the ACA and TSCA, the new TACA will develop programming and other services for administrators in Texas. V.A. Smith of the Communication and Theatre Department, Texas A&I University, Kingsville, chaired the organizational meeting.

REGIONAL ACA PROGRAMMING

Savannah to Host SETC

Lorayne Lester, working closely with the officers of the Southeastern Theatre Conference to strengthen the affiliate status between the associations, has put together three programs for the SETC convention in Savannah, March 2-6, 1983.

Administrative Burn-Out: Ideas and Alternative

Chair: Robert N. Hall, ACA Executive Secretary

Participants: Robert Bostrom, University of Kentucky
John Lee Jellicorse, University of North Carolina, Greensboro
August Staub, University of Georgia
Lorayne W. Lester, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

The attrition rate among academic administrators is almost three times higher than among general faculty. This panel will explore the reasons for burn-out, alternative strategies, and good techniques.

Training for the Profession: The Relationship of the Professional (LORT) Theatre to the Conservatory Training Program

Chair: Milly Barranger, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Participants: Richard Fallon, Florida State University
Gregory Boyd, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
David Rotenberg, The Carolina Players
Robert Ulmer, Asolo State Theatre, Florida

This program will be a group discussion of the philosophies and connections important to these two theatre programs.

Tenure and Promotion: Are Theatre Faculty Getting Their Just Deserts?

Chair: Lorayne Lester, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Participants: Paul A. Distler, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Stephen M. Archer, University of Missouri, Columbia
G. Allen Yeomans, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Jon Whitmore, West Virginia University
James A. Patterson, University of South Carolina

An overview of tenure-promotion prospects and procedures in the Southeast; special concern will be made of departmental strategies, professional expectations, and advice to junior faculty members.

Figuring Workload Equivalents of Performance/Production Assignments for Theatre Faculty

Chair: Josie Helming, Memphis State University

Participants: Donald Loeffler, Western Carolina University
Robert Mashburn, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Robert Yowell, University of Alabama, Birmingham
Richard Johnson, Georgia Southern College
Harold Frank, East Tennessee State University
Richard Palmer, William & Mary College
Joe Ferrell, Georgetown College

An overview and practical strategies discussion for obtaining release time through producion credit.

WSCA Meets in Albuquerque

The ACA will strengthen its affiliate ties with WSCA by sponsoring two programs in Albuquerque. The WSCA convention is scheduled for the Four Season Motel, February 18-22, 1983.

Toward A Definition of the Field of Speech Communication

Chair: Malcolm O. Sillars, University of Utah

Participants: Alvin Goldberg, University of Denver: Approaching the Field from a Social Science Perspective

Mary Susan Strine, University of Utah: Approaching the Field from a Humanistic-Artistic Perspective

Theodore Clevenger, Florida State University: Speech Communication within the Broader Communication Field

Crisis Aversion: The Communication Department Under Threat

Chair: Thorrell Fest, University of Colorado, Boulder

Participants: Thorrell Fest, University of Colorado)
Thomas Frantz, University of Colorado) The Crisis from a Faculty Perspective
Donald Darnell, University of Colorado)
Sarah Hankins, University of Colorado) The Crisis from a Graduate Student Perspective
Kenneth Andersen, University of Illinois) The Crisis from a Professional Association Perspective

Orlando Welcomes SSCA

The ACA, in cooperation with the Southern Association, has planned the following program for the convention in Orlando, April 6-9, 1983.

Politics and Persuasion: Building and Maintaining a Communication Studies Program in a Small Liberal Arts College

Chair: James Hoban

Participants: James Hoban, Randolph-Macon Woman's College
Brownlee Corrin, Goucher College
Rex Mix, Lynchburg College
Charles DeLancey, Furman University

A second program was scheduled too late for inclusion into the *Bulletin*. It deals with President Clevenger's theme for the 1983 Seminar, "Defining the Profession."

Lincoln is Site for CSSA, and ACA Executive Committee

The ACA Executive Committee will meet with CSSA as the Committee continues its policy of meeting with affiliates. At the same convention in Lincoln, April 7-10, 1983, two programs are planned.

Survival Through Curricular Response: 3 Perspectives

Chair: Jon Hall, University of Northern Iowa

Participants: Don Morlan, University of Dayton: The Politics of Survival at Home: Bargaining Power on Campus
John Cragan, Illinois State University: Strategies for Linking Communication Coursework in Various Academic Programs
Mari Tonn and Laura Meeks: The Non-Traditional College Student in Communication: The Administrative Function of Continuing Education Programs

In times of financial austerity and educational accountability, the creation and maintenance of a power base on one's local campus is a task confronting communication administrators. This program explores the way in which three institutions have addressed that task through curricular development.

Experiential Learning Formats: Issues, Concerns, and Practical Advice for the Administrator

Chair: Jon Hall, University of Northern Iowa

Participants: Lynn Phelps, Ohio University: Internships and Experiential Learning Formats in a Non-Metropolitan Area
Kevin McCleary, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Internships and Experiential Learning Formats in a Metropolitan Area
A PANEL Representative: PANEL, A Resource for Insternship Development

Internships, field experiences, cooperative education and other forms of learning outside the classroom are becoming both popular and integral to communication programs. Development, implementation, supervision, and evaluation of experiential learning experiences have raised problems for administrators. This program is designed to explore many of the issues related to experiential learning formats.

ECA Meets at Maryland Resort

The Eastern Communication Association will return to the Carousel Hotel in Ocean City, Maryland, April 27-30, 1983. The following is the ACA program to be presented.

Saving the Speech Communication Department

Chair: Andrew D. Wolvin, University of Maryland

Participants: Gerald Goldhaber, SUNY, Buffalo
Kathleen Kendall, SUNY, Albany
Jay Saveried, University of Massachusetts
Stanley Paulson, Pennsylvania State University

Speech communication departments which have recently come under scrutiny for possible abolition have raised concern for all departments in higher education. The three chairpersons on this panel have encountered difficulties on their campuses and will discuss their problems. Dean Paulson offers reactions and suggestions as to how a department can make an effective case for retention in this time of reversion and reallocation

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Pattie P. Gillespie is the Chairperson and a Professor, Department of Communication Arts and Theatre, University of Maryland, College Park.

John A. Walker is a Professor in the Department of Theatre, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Stephen M. Archer is a Professor in the the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Philip Hill is the Chairperson and a Professor, Department of Drama, Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina.

Vera Mowry Roberts is a Professor, Department of Theatre and Film, New York, New York.

Greg Kunesh is the Chairperson and a Professor, Department of Theatre, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

William Grange is the Chairperson and a Professor, Department of Theatre, Florida Southern College, Lakeland.

Larry D. Clark is a Professor in the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Alvin Goldfarb is the Chairperson and an Associate Professor, Department of Theatre, Illinois State University, Normal.

Albert J. Harris is the Chairman and a Professor, Department of Theatre Arts and Speech, University of Louisville, Kentucky.

Sidney J. Friedman is an Associate Professor, School of Theatre Arts, Boston University, Massachusetts.

Daniel W. Alkofer is the Head and a Professor, Department of Theatre, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Lynn Murray was 1982 President of the Secondary School Theatre Association of the ATA. "The Evaluative Criteria for Theatre Arts" is reprinted with permission.

Philip Emmert is a Professor in the Department of Communication, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

Theodore Clevenger, Jr., is Dean of the College of Communication, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Dennis J. Sporre is the Chairperson and a Professor, Department of Creative Arts, University of North Carolina, Wilmington.

Gregory B. Adams is in the School of Law at the University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Jeffrey Huberman is the Chairperson and a Professor, Department of Theatre, Indiana-Purdue University, Ft. Wayne.

William V. Patterson is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Arts and Theatre, University of Maryland, College Park.

D. Terry Williams is the Chairman and a Professor, Department of Theatre, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Lorayne W. Lester is an Associate Professor, Department of Speech and Theatre, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Dorothy Webb is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication and Theatre, Indiana-Purdue University, Indianapolis.

Miriam Morton is a writer and translator of books for and about children. She lives in Kendall Park, New Jersey.

Susan Pearson-Davis is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Theatre Arts, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Joanne E. Tracy is the Theatrical Coordinator in the Department of Theatre Arts, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.

In the October issue of the Bulletin Lauren Wispe was listed in the Department of Psychology, University of Oklahoma. He is in the Communication Department.

THE ACA BULLETIN

Robert N. Hall
Executive Secretary & Editor

Priscilla H. Thomas
Assistant to the Editor

Editorial Board

Robert Boren	Boise State University
Raymond Cheydleur	Manatee Junior College
Patti P. Gillespie	University of Maryland
Robert C. Jeffrey	University of Texas
Robert O. Weiss	De Pauw University

William E. Arnold, Book Review Editor, Arizona State University

The ACA BULLETIN is a quarterly publication of the Association for Communication Administration. The BULLETIN is published by the ACA, 5105 Backlick Road, #E, Annandale, Virginia, 22003. The ACA BULLETIN is published in January, April, August, and October.

Membership in the ACA is open to any academic department or administrative unit at an annual dues of $30.00. All memberships are on a July 1 - June 30 fiscal year basis.

Articles are welcomed for consideration for publication in the BULLETIN. Manuscripts should be typed double-spaced. Three copies of each manuscript should be submitted.

1983 Officers

Theodore Clevenger, Jr., President	Florida State University
James E. Roever, President-Elect	University of Wisconsin, Whitewater

Executive Committee

Paul Batty, 1985	Parkland College
Samuel L. Becker, 1983	University of Iowa
Theodore Clevenger, Jr., 1983	Florida State University
Philip Emmert, 1984	University of Wyoming
Patti P. Gillespie, 1985	University of Maryland
Annabel Hagood, 1984	University of Alabama, University
Lorayne W. Lester, 1983	University of Tennessee, Knoxville
James E. Roever, 1984	University of Wisconsin, Whitewater
Jon Whitmore, 1985	West Virginia University
Robert N. Hall, *Ex-officio*	National Office

Copyright, © 83 ACA